"ROLE OF HUSAIN AHMED MADNI IN NATIONAL MOVEMENT"

Thesis submitted to

Dr. BABASAHEB AMBEDKAR MARATHWADA UNIVERSITY, AURANGABAD.

For
THE AWARD OF Ph.D. DEGREE
IN
POLITICAL SCIENCE

BY
KHAN TALAT SULTANA

Under the Guidance of
Dr. MOHAMMED UMAR
Professor
Department of Political Science
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Marathwada University,
Aurangabad, Maharashtra

JANUARY 2014

Husain Ahmed Madani (1879-1957)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the Research work carried out by **Khan Talat Sultana D/o Gulam Azam Khan** for the award of Ph.D. degree and incorporated in the thesis entitled **"Role of Husain Ahmed Madani in National Movement"** is original and has not been earlier submitted by her, for the award of any degree of this or any other University.

Place : Aurangabad

Date :

Dr. Mohammed Umar
Research Guide
Department of Political Science
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Marathwada University, Aurangabad (Maharashtra)

DECLARATION

I, **Khan Talat Sultana D/o Gulam Azam Khan** hereby declare that the research work submitted in the form of thesis entitled **"Role of Husain Ahmed Madani in National Movement"** has not been submitted by me earlier for the award of any diploma or degree of this or any other university.

The present research work is completely original to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Place : Aurangabad

Date :

Khan Talat Sultana D/o
Gulam Azam Khan
Research Student
Department of Political Science
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Marathwada
University, Aurangabad (Maharashtra)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to acknowledge the help I received in completing this thesis all those who have supported me to make this work meaningful and fruitful.

Initially I wish to present my acknowledgment and my heart full thanks to my guide Dr. Mohammed Umar for his unmatched and uncountable sincere guidance, untiring cooperation and help during the course of this work. I am thankful to him for encouraging me in this endevour. He provided me friendly behaviour and proper channel for carrying out the present work systematically and effectively.

I am also thankful to the H.O.D. & staff of Department of Political Science, Librarian and Library Staff of Dr. B.A.M.U. Aurangabad for their ready and unfailing help.

I further wish to thank the staff of Maulana Azad Research Centre, Majnu Hill, Aurangabad and the Management, Officials,

Librarian and the Library Staff of Dr. Rafiq Zakaria College for Women for their cooperation.

I am grateful to Asjad Madani for providing me the authentic knowledge. Thanks are also to Al Jamiat Book Depot, New Delhi for their cooperation.

I am also thankful to my parents, brothers, Sisters, In-laws, Friends, Relatives; Especially I appreciate the cooperation of my children Juveriya & Irteza. I am to thank my husband M. Shafeeque whose constant inspiration, encouragement, sympathetic attitude and guidance were always with me like a shadow.

Khan Talat Sultana

INDEX

CHAPTER - 1

INTRODUCTION

The response of the global Muslim community to the challenges of the 20th Century was marked, paradoxically, by resistance and heroic struggle passivity and submission. The indomitable courage and heroism of the Muslim ummah was reflected in a series of anti-colonial struggle from the former Soviet Union to Indonesia and from Algeria to the Indian sub-continent. It was also evident in the Pan-Islamic as well as regional Islamic movements which aimed at the revival and rejuvenation of Islamic consciousness. The passivity and resignation of the community was reflected in the support and co-operation extended by a section of the ummah to colonial rule and in the persistence of the colonial legacy, in politics, economy, education, culture and history even after the passing of the colonial era.[1]

The history of a country is prone to be influenced by its geography, just as the political institution of people to be influenced by their region. The Indian sub-continent is well known for its variety and contrast. Himalaya which is situated in the North also known as the house of snow, its peaks and uninhabited gothic ranges form the roof of the world. In the West

are the deserts of Rajasthan and Baluchi with their bitting winter cold and ferocious summer heat where rainfall is so rare. In the north from the Punjab, in the West to Bengal in the East, stretches the Indo Genetic plain. The people of this vast sub-continent are as diverse as its topography. Indian society is particularly complex and demonstrates much the same kind of ambivalence. It has features that set apart from the societies of other countries and give it a unique flavour.[2] There is hardly any other country, so vast in area inhabited by a variety of races following different religions, speaking so many languages, professing diversity of customs which has developed in the course of a hundred years. The consciousness of national unity constituting the basis of freedom that is why the freedom movement in India is a unique phenomenon and it holds a prominent and predominant place in the history of Asia, particularly in India.[3]

From Ancient times India had been an industrial and commercial country. Industries were found in abundance, with qualitative handicraftsmen and artisans, they used to produce such delicate goods which were demanded from every corner of the world.[4] Before British conquest India cannot be described as feudal in the European sense of the term. The land relations in India were not manorial like European feudal society. The peasants did not belong to serf hood. India was divided into several kingdoms of varying size where the king or prince was supreme having

military character. The state carried out two main functions, police duties and collection of revenue. The Government undertook to defend the country from foreign invasion and internal rebellion and to safeguard life and properties in the cities, by its own agents. There were administrative units who used to formulate policy for vast rural areas. It was done by local chowkidars who were the servants of the village community and not of the state. The village thus enjoyed a considerable amount of self rule. Village lives were not affected by changing rulers frequently.

The land tax was the main source of revenue and it was collected in accordance with well defined principles of Government officers. The share of each cultivator was being determined by the village community. The land revenue was collected in kind or money.[5] The village was largely a self-sufficient unit. Agriculture was in keeping with this. The village land produced most of the agricultural commodities needed by it, a few things were imported into the village.[6] Towns in India were non-industrial in character. They were firstly religious and pilgrimage centers, like Banaraspur, Allahadpur, secondly political centers such as seats of government like Poona, Tanjore and thirdly, trade route from central India to Bengal. In such town specialization and concentration were marked. They mainly manufactured luxury goods or artistic wares. Barter was prevalent

over a very wide field. Money transactions were carried out in gold and silver coins.

The prince was the Final Court of appeal, but, the judicial system as a whole was not systematically organized. As it existed in Madras in the 18th Century gives a good general account of it. “There was generally no code of law generally recognized as being in force; and even Hindu and Mohammedan law books were supposed to have authority, there were no regular courts in existence to interpret or give effect to them, or to solidify custom and precedent into law. Petty crime was dealt with by the village headmen and most civil disputes were settled in the village panchayats or juries. Caste offences were punished by caste headmen or caste panchayats, the State only interfering to raise revenue by leasing out the right to levy fines. Grave crimes could be brought before the Amildar, who might inflict any punishment short of death. There were no jails, and imprisonment was not a recognized form of punishment. Mutilation for the poor and fines for the rich were the order of the day. The proceedings of the Amildar were controlled not by law, but by his sense of equity. There was always the possibility of an appeal to the sovereign, but access to him was difficult and the chance of a careful inquiry small.”[7]

Centuries ago, before the rise of Britishers India had been the top of all the countries of the world, as far as its wealth and economic

condition were concern. Because of it the greedy eyes of the imperialist nations of the world were trying to take interest in India. Prof. Herian wrote in 'Historical Research' that "In Ancient times India was famous for its wealth." In a letter to Mr. Kalbert, the famous traveler itinerant of France Writes, "It (India) is such an ocean where the big part of the gold and silver of the world is accumulated."[8]

The Muslim conquerors were however not religious fanatics and they soon adopted themselves to Indian conditions and culture. They patronized Indian languages and evolved Urdu as the language of literary expression and common use.[9] Sir P.C. Roa the famous Bengali leader said, "During the era of Aurangazeb, the hindus hold important post and were given *Jagirs* by Aurangazeb. He made them governors and viceroys even the viceroy of Afghanistan (the purely Muslim state) was Hindu Rajput.[10]

According to Lord William Bentinck "on various grounds the Islamic governments were better than those of Britishers. Muslims conquered this land and got inhabited. They maintained friendly and good relations with Indians. They got married with them. They had given many rights to Indian nationalities. There was no difference between victorious and defeated one. In contrast with it the British policy was selfish and careless. They held all the powers and Indian found themselves helpless."[11]

Before the advent of British the Indian families regulated the relations of its members among themselves caste and village community played a vital role in governing relation between families. Entry into a caste was by birth alone. The state did not directly concern itself with the internal affairs of the caste or family.[12] Sir Thomas Minro says about the condition of India; before the possession of British; was,

"Indians have unparalleled skills and methods of agriculture and industry. They had specialization in these fields. In every village such type of schools exists which imparts the training of reading, writing and mathematics. Every individual has the spirit of hospitality ad charity. People have trust on women where such features exist. We cannot say that this nation or people are uncivilized and uncultured. On the basis of these features we cannot declare that India is inferior to European nations. If there is trade of culture and civilization between India and Britain, then I am confident that whatever culture will be imported from India to Britain, it will be beneficial to British."[13]

Like other Europeans, Britishmen also were desirous of getting the things produced in India and the Far East. In September, 1599, a resolution was passed under the chairmanship of Lord Mayor to form an association to trade directly with India. On 1st December 1600 Queen Elizabeth granted a charter, the charter authorized the London Company to

trade freely. In 1615, Sir Thomas Roe was sent to the court of Jahangir by James-I king of England. He was successful in securing certain trading stations at Aramgoan and Masuripatam.[14] There were many stages in the growth of the company from the position of a mercantile body to that of the paramount power in India. Beginning from the victory of plassey (on June 1757) set in the strong tide of British conquest of India. In 1764 the emperor of Delhi was defeated at the battle of Buxer and in 1765 he gave legal recognition to the transfer of power by the grant of the Diwani of the provinces of Bengal, Bihar and Orrisa. In 1772 Warren Hastings assumed direct authority over these territories and began to lay down the foundation of the system of administration.[15]

When the English men set their feet on the soil of India, their primary mission was not merely commercial. It was in fact mixed with political ambitions, economic exploitation and territorial acquisition. Fortunately, for them, they found the Indian soil suitable and fertile for their imperialistic designs. India in those days was divided into congeries of states. The despotic kings were mainly engaged in pitching their camps against each other. The very concept of India as one Nation was unknown to them. If it was known to some, the conditions were such that no common card of on culture and civilization could find them together. They lack the feelings of oneness.[16]

Social life in the Eighteenth Century was marked by Stagnation and dependence on the past. There was no uniformity of culture and social pattern by religion, region, tribe, language and caste. The social system had two aspects one aspect was a grading on the basis of official power and position. The second aspect was an ordinary based on religion and the traditional divisions of society. For a long time there was political instability in the country after the death of Aurangazeb, there was practically no administration, no law and security in the vast areas of the country. Anarchy was the order of the day. The Englishmen, who were to establish their empire in India, exploit this situation to the full and widened the gulf among Indians. They sincerely follow their policy of 'Divide and rule', as they had to rule over India? [17]

India of the Eighteenth century was a land of contrasts extreme poverty existed side by side with extreme riches and luxury. While the nobles were rich, powerful and steeped in luxury and comfort the peasants were oppressed and impoverished. Majority of people were facing severe economic problems and strive hard for their bread and butter.[18] The servants of the East India Company penetrated into all parts of the country and compelled the handicraftsmen to deal exclusively with them. The prices of the monopolized goods were arbitrarily fixed by the officials and the producers were freed mercilessly. The weavers were compelled to enter into

engagements to work for the English company and, if there was a breach of contract, they were punished with fine, imprisonment flogging etc.[19]

Sir Melcom Louis 'the Chief Justice of (High Court) Madras member council, wrote in a magazine from London.' We had disgraced Indian castes cancelled their law of inheritance, changed the principles of institution of marriages, insulted religions rites and rituals. We had confiscated their estates, named them ungrateful (*Kafir*) in governmental documents. We had confiscated princely states, exploited the country received land revenue forcefully and violently destroyed most dignified families and made them vagabond."[20]

About the administrative system of the East India Company Dr. R.C. Majumdar writes that there was security against foreign aggression but not against theft, robbery and crimes and oppression of other kinds. The law courts had not yet become efficient instrument of impartial justice. The police served as agencies of oppression rather than protection.[21]

The British domination in India put out a big blaze of discontent and dissatisfaction through out India. This was not confined to the ruling chief's and royal families of the states conquered by the British or annexed by them on various grounds and not even to the immediate attendants and dependants of those royal courts. British rule was not

favourably looked upon even by the people at large in any region where it was newly introduced. Discontent was particularly strong in Burma, Assam, Coorg, Sindh, Punjab and Avadh. The disposition of ruler of Satara, The despotic coercion of Sindhia and other such acts created a feeling of hatred and hostility against the British.[22]

Indian culture and society were very much influenced by British impact. British rule in India brought this country into contact with the Western ideas. The intellectual life of the people of India began to undergo revolutionary changes through the ideas of democracy, sovereignty and humanism. These new ideas helped the people of India to examine critically their own economy and the true nature of British imperialism in India. Modern ideas were spread by the press and political parties.[23]

Out of all round degeneration decay and destruction there came down upon the horizon of India, a new renaissance which gave birth to great men like Rajaram Mohan Roy, Swami Dayanand, Saraswati, Dada Bhai Nooroji, Feroz Shah Mehta, M.G. Ranade, R.C.Dutt, Arvind Ghosh, Mahatma Gandhi, Sardar Vallabhai Patel, Maulana Azad, Nehru and many others. In this, very turbulent period great organization like Brahmo Samaj, Arya Samaj, the theosophical society, the Ram Krishna Mission, the Aligarh movement was found, and the development of a powerful nationalist movement took place in the country. It embraced within its fold all the

classes and groups of the Indian society sank their mutual differences and worked for the freedom of the country.[24]

It was a period marked by a vigorous response to the Western colonial rule in the Indian sub-continent highly influential movement for Islamic rejuvenation and freedom of the country was launched. Jamiat was also associated with anti colonial struggle. It was founded in 1919 by Abdul Mohsin Sajjad, Qazi Husain Ahmed, Ahmed saeed Dehlvi and Abdul Bari Firangi Mehli, Maulana Mahmud-ul- Hasan a leading Islamic scholar of that time was the guiding force behind the initiative. Jamiat's involvement in the Khilafat movement brought them close to Mahatma Gandhi and Indian National congress. Jamial-ul-ulama opposed the creation of a separate Muslim state of Pakistan. Jamiat was the first to declare boycott of the Simon Commission. Many leaders of Jamiat were imprisoned. It espoused the theory of composite nationalism in the context of India. According to which Hindus, Muslims and other religious communities could live together in Peace and amity and could jointly contribute to the process of Nation Building.[25]

Most of the members of Jamiat were the products of the well-known institution of Islamic learning in India, that is Dar-ul-uloom, Deoband, which was established by Maulana Qasim Nanatavi (1832-1930) it was the off shoot of the inspiration that had motivated the Ulama (Islamic

Scholar) to actively participated in the Mutiny of 1857 to throw the British out of the country. Another biography 'says in his preface, "The ulama were the first to give warning against the threat to India's political power and cultural life from the British who come seeking trade facilities and through cunning manipulation of contradictions among local rulers and chieftains became the rulers over this rich country. It was their inspiration that resulted in the first great uprising in 1857 which the British called the mutiny and patriotic Indians termed as the first war of Independence."[26]

Muslims considered the British rule as a threat to the temporal power of Muslim monarchs and to the spiritual values and religion of Islam. Shah Abdul Aziz, the son and the successor of the well known scholar-innovator of the Islamic tradition Shah Waliullah, had proclaimed that to carry on Jihad (religious war) was the duty of every Muslim because under their rule it was not easy and possible for Muslim to freely perform their religious duties and preach their religion. He had launched a movement of Jihad that was defeated but his followers found in the revolt of the sepoys an opportunity to achieve that aim. Maulana Qasim Nanatvi was one of them and had participated in the uprising as commander –in-chief of the free government that was set up at Thana Bhuvan under the leadership of Haji Imdadullah.

Dar-ul-uloom thus was in the struggle against colonial power by other means in another form.[27] It was a centre of revolution and political training. It nurtured such a body of sacrificing soldiers of Islam and sympathizers of the community who themselves wept in the grief of the community and also made others weep. They shattered the Muslims intellectual, stagnation; they broke up the spell of the British imperialism and grapping with the contemporary tyrannical powers among these towering personalities. The Jamiat-ul-ulema shoulder to shoulder with the Indian national congress spent its force in awakening the country politically and socially. Maulana Mufti Kifayatullah Delhvi, Maulana Sayyed Faqruddin Ahmed and later on Maulana Hifz-ur-Rehman, Maulana Mufti Ateeq-ur-Rehman Usmani, Maulana Mehmoodullah Rehmani, Maulana Habib-ur-Rehman Ludhyanvi, Maulana Muhammed Miyan Deobandi and many others of Deoband not only remained in the forefront of the movement for the freedom of the country but they have also been the cause of coming into being of several other movements and have consequently suffered the hardships of imprisonment in jail.[28]

Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani's home land is village Alhadpur Tanda in Faizabad District. He was born on October 16, 1879 (19, Shawal, 1296 H) in village Bangermau district Unao. His father syed habibullah was the head master of a school at Bangermau. His family

migrated to India in the Nineteenth generation for learning piety. His ancestors were given a big Jagir (endowment) by the mughal rulers that were confiscated by the British for their involvement in the 1857 uprising.

Madani received his early education from his father, which was mainly religious.[29] After having acquired early education in the primary school, at the age of twelve years, he came to Deoband and took admission in the first standard to read 'Mizanus Sarf'. Maulana was seen to have prodigious memory and quick grasp of the subjects taught, he remembered whatever was taught in the class-room without going through the books himself or discussing them with the teachers. The Examination at Dar-ul-uloom, whether written or oral required ready and instant mastery of courses, no books were specified only the date and time of the Examination was announced. Life at Dar-ul-uloom was very hard and Spartan. There being no cash stipend there was no scope for fencing eating in the market even for visits home Maulana, and also his brothers had to depend upon the monthly pocket expense of one rupee that they received from him. He spent about seven years at the Deoband Seminary and in that period passed all the courses and received the degree.[30] Here Shaikh-ul-Hind Maulana Mahmud-ul- Hasan taught and trained him with special affection and attention. He became the spiritual disciple of Maulana Ubaidullah Sindhi and Maulana Rashid Ahmed Gangohi while completing his studies in Deoband. Husain

Ahmed migrated to Arabia with his entire family in 1899 and spent most of his time in the Prophet's mosque in Medinah where he met great men of religion and made full use of liberaries in the holy city and delivered sermons regularly. His Sermons were attended by contemporary religious scholars as well as students from Asian and African countries. He imparted instruction in Hadith for a decade and gave continuous lectures for hours together. He was highly respected and hailed with the epithel Shaikh-ul-Arab-wal-Ajam. During his stay in Arabia his spiritual teacher was Haji Imdadullah, who was already residing there. He immensely benefited from his company. [31]

Maulana being a staunch adherent of the tenants of Islam that insist on human equality was averse to flaunting personal pedigree even though the practice continued to prevail through out Islamic world. He never used Syed as a Prefix to his name in any. In his autobiography he wrote.

"Distinction and pride in birth is a vile disease and Islam has incessantly struggled to eradicate it. Sadly enough this false pride and arrogance still prevails among Indian Muslims though it should have disappeared from their hearts and minds." (Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani: A biographical study by Dr. Goyal Page No. 14).

In this context his letters are very significant because they are eminently candid and transparent one of his correspondents had regretted

how some people didn't accept his status as Syed. Responding to the complaint he wrote back.

> "People who have denied are alone answerable for this calumny. So far as I am concerned I don't even use this prefix with my name. The reason is that lineage is not the road to salvation; a person of high birth would face the curse of God if his conduct is evil as was the case of Nuh's son whereas a person of low birth, if pious Mussalman like Bilal and Suhaib, would be deserving of divine blessing and benediction. My conduct does not come up to that standard, therefore, I feel shame in making claim to that status."

The letter is significant as it highlights two prominent traits of Maulana's character. First it shows that he was averse to asserting his distinction on the basis of his lineage and sought to be judged purely and exclusively on the basis of his own attainments and conduct. Secondly, it reflects that, like a true follower of the Prophet's practice, he never denounced or condemned even those who ill treated him or were unfair to him, this trait as we shall see latter, appears again and again through out his life.

In his autobiography he expressed gratitude to God who blessed him with the ability to revive the lost spiritual tradition.

He considered his autobiography as a token of love and gratitude for all the blessings that God had showered upon him, he writes.

> "Raising our family from the depths of decay and decline into which Vicissitudes of life and times had thrown it was a divine dispensation for which no words of gratitude are adequate. Traditionally the family always had one or two practitioners of divine meditation and quite a number of initiators into divine practices but a little before 1857 it was bereft of all such personalities and all became worldly creatures. Spiritual knowledge and mysticism yielded place to ignorance and self-service. The events of 1857 destroyed even that and all the amassed with was plundered. All property lost, the family fell into the grip of poverty and destitution."

The above discussion is the most important key to understand Maulana's character, moral and conduct.

Maulana was not an affluent or rich person by hereditary but God has bestowed upon him courage and sagacity like sovereigns and

Ambiya (Messengers of God on earth). He was seldom seen to be grateful of others but obligated the whole world. His home was the widest guest house of India and his *Dastarkhawn* (Dinning Carpet) was the widest *Dastarkhawn* of India, actually he was an open hearted man. Regularly, about 50 guests from every class and society had their meals at his house. His hospitality and cheerfulness showed that he got spiritual pleasure. At every occasion he tried to impart benefit rather than seeking benefit. If any person renders any kind of help to him, he tries to compensate it as early as possible. Generosity and heroism were the part of disposition (manners). From the extracts of his letters and books it came into light that, what he thinks of himself and almighty gave him sublime dignity and modesty.

Being a follower of the tradition of latest Indian scholarship in Islam set by Shah Waliullah Dehlvi, the famous interpreter and teacher of Hadith (traditions and sayings of the Prophet), he supports his views by quoting at length the views on the subject of Shah Waliullah's eminent descendent Syed Ahmed Shaheed who had enjoined upon the persons of even high spiritual attainment to give all respect to common Muslims and treat every one with due respect to his status and position in life.

He argues that, "The pride in ancestry that is found among Muslims in general, and among Indian Muslims in particular, especially among the Sheikhs and Peer Zadas and Syeds, is utterly false and is the

source of many evils. Although Islam has left no stone unturned to uproot this vain pride it has unfortunately persisted and in fact it was increased by imitation of the other country men.''[32]

During his stay in Medina, Maulana was exposed to the international political situation and the Islamic world. He was shocked that all Islamic countries were targets of anti-Muslim, imperialist and colonialist forces. India too was under British rule and its own countrymen were leading miserable lives. Hejaz was going to become a victim of the British conspiracy with Sharif Husain. The Caliphate of Turkey was threatened by Britain, and when the World War I broke out in 1914, Turkey joined hands with Germany against Britain and France.[33]

Haj time brings Muslims from all over the world to Mecca to perform a religious duty and thus seek the blessings of God and His Prophet. In 1915 came an extraordinary visitor, the head of Deoband *madarsa* (seiminary) Sheikh-ul-Hind Maulana Mehmud-ul- Hasan. He was called Sheikh-ul- Hind (leader of India) by an overwhelming majority of Indian Muslims not only because of his deep understanding of Islamic lore but also because of his sensitivity to the political problems. His mission was something more than the normal intention of the *hajis* (pilgrims). What transpired during the visit transformed the life of Maulana from a prominent teacher to teacher-cum-political activists. In his autobiography he writes:

> World War (1914-18) added a new chapter in my life story i.e., my entry into politics and my resolve to bring about of revolution against British imperialism. Even as Sheikh-ul-Hind was the wellspring of my intellectual life, the source of my political activity was also the corpus of his sentiments and ideals that had always smoldered in his mind but which had fired up with the advent of war.

In one of his letters he wrote:

> I have been participating in the movements for India's independence since 1914 and consider it the religious obligation of Muslims. First I was a member of the revolutionary party that believed in violence and the late Sheikh-ul-Hind was our leader. Malta incarceration was a part of that.[34]

`When Shaikh-ul-Hind Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan chalked out a plan to oust the British from India with the help of Turkey. He met Turkish ministers, took them into confidence and obtained their letters for the people of North West Frontier Province in India assuring them of help in their fight against the British. These messages were written on silk fabric; later the government dubbed it as 'silk conspiracy'. Maulana Madani also

joined Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan in Makkah, who was being shadowed by the British intelligence officers. On the issue of a fatwa in favor of Sharif Husain, Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan was arrested along with his disciples, including Maulana Madni.

All of them were exiled to Malta where they remained detained for more than four years. In jail, Maulana Madani served Maulana Mahmud Hasan, his revered teacher to the utmost. This detention in Malta reinforced his convinction that the British were to be turned out from India as they were a menace to Islam and the country. The Maulanas were released in 1920 and they set sail for Bombay. For many years, Maulana Madani was addressed as *Aseer-e-Malta* (prisoner of Malta). The climate of Malta did not suit him and he fell critically ill. Shaikh-ul-Hind breathed his last on November 30, 1920 but not before approving of the Khilafat and Non-cooperation movement launched by Mahatma Gandhi.[35]

Of his advent into politics Maulana writes in his autobiography.

> This Great War added a new chapter to the story of my life, that is, 'my relationship with politics and the resolve for anti-British revolution'. Just as the mainspring of my academic intellectual life was Sheikhul-Hind Maulana Mehmud-ul-Hasan of revered memory, even so were the thoughts, ideas and sentiments of the

> Sheikh that were developing in his enlightened mind for a long time and which had been kindled by the happenings during the war.

Maulana had single-mindedly devoted himself to dissemination of Islamic knowledge during his stay in Madina till the arrival of Sheikh-ul-Hind. In his autobiography he says:

> Till then I had not participated in the mission of independence nor had I any knowledge about the activities of Sheikh-ul-Hind. On arrival in Madina he invited me and Maulana Khalil Ahmad for a special meeting and acquainted us with his ideas and activities in this respect. Till then I was engaged exclusively in pursuit of knowledge although once I had made a speech to motivate volunteers for going to the Suez front and some people did feel inspired to join the struggle there. Now both Maulana Khalil Ahmad and I were deeply impressed by the views and activities of the Sheikh. That was the time of my political baptism, my first steps in the field of politics.

This could well be described as the tribute of a devoted disciple to the teacher and mentor who had played a major role in the mental and moral upbringing of the person concerned but Maulana's plunge in politics

was more an expression of his own reaction to events that mere sentimental attachment to the revered teacher. If it were a sentimental response he would not have put the condition that he would not stay beyond the need for his assistance in the Sheikh's writing work. In the words of the eminent historian Dr. Tara Chand,

> Husain Ahmad had entered the field of politics at the instance of his revered teacher and leader Mahmud-ul- Hasan (*sic*). But his politics were not emotional. His was an intellectual approach to the problems of society and state. This is amply proved by his writings on India's politics and economics and on international affairs.[36]

The national madarsa, the institution conceived by Maulana Azad as an alternative to Madarsa Alia, was inaugurated by Mahatma Gandhi after Maulana Husain Ahmad reached Calcutta. Asking them to remain steadfast in the resolve behind the new institution Gandhiji said:

> At the moment Islam is under threat. Khilafat has been destroyed. The holy places of Islam have been captured. India's self respect has been challenged in Punjab. It is your duty now to undertake these activities and carry out all the obligations that you owe to Islam and India. Teachers should

> impart religious education that should make the pupils true Mussalman and true Hindustani. The objective for which national seminaries are being launched is to prepare people who would shun slavery and lay down their life for freedom. I know that Islam inspires love for entire humankind.

That became the starting point of Maulana's political activism. His reputation as teacher of *Hadith* had spread all over even when he was in Madina. The incarceration in Malta along with Sheikh-ul -Hind gave him a halo as a political leader. By that time he also became a regular member of Congress. He began to be invited to the public meetings of Congress, Jamiat-ul-Ulama and Khilafat Committee. The speeches he made in those meetings and conferences show that he had already formulated clear political ideas. The political culture the seeds of which were sown during the brief encounter with Anwar Pasha and Jamal Pasha had matured during the stay in Malta where he came in contact with freedom fighters of different nationalities. It meant that complete freedom for India should be the goal and for this Muslims must work in cooperation with the Hindus. The movement under Gandhi was a concrete manifestation of that culture and that spirit. No wonder the Maulan took to the national movement under Gandhi like fish takes to water; he saw in it the fulfillment of the dream they had dreamt.

In those days a joint session of Jamiat-ul -Ulama, Congress and Khilafat Committee was held at Maulvi Bazaar, District Sylhet of Assam (the district now is part of Bangladesh). The Congress session was presided over by Congress leader C.R. Das and the other two by Maulana. In the same year he was invited to preside over a conference of the Khilafat Committee in Seohara, District Bijnore (U.P.). A perusal of his presidential addresses shows that he impressed upon his audiences, obviously consisting mainly of Muslims, the need for wholehearted support to the national struggle for freedom.[37]

Maulana participated in the *Khilafat* and Non-cooperation movement and made an appeal to Muslims all over the country not to cooperate with the British. At a *Khilafat* conference held in Karachi he spoke in favor of non-cooperation ad endorsed Maulana Mohammed Ali's resolution that it was *irreligious* for Muslims to serve the British army.

His fatwa in favor of non-co-operation movement made Britisher angry and he was sentenced to two years of imprisonment. After his release he presided over the Jamiat-ul-Ulama conference at Kakinada in December 1923. In his presidential address Maulana Madani declared that the European countries had, whenever and wherever possible, been attacking Islam, depriving Muslim countries of their possessions and destroying their power. Besides, he said, the colonial powers were branding Indians as

uncivilized while they themselves were committing every uncivilized act to enslave the Indians. Among all European countries, he declared, England was the worst enemy of Islam. In his view, Allied powers had buried Islam at Sevres and it was Mustafa Kamal Ataturk who had frustrated the evil designs of the enemy. The British had destroyed Indian trade and economy, killed its industries and introduced a system of education injurious to India. It was therefore the first and foremost duty of Muslims to stand against the British government. The second duty was to rid the holy places and the Arabian Peninsula of foreign control. The third duty of Muslims of India was to work for the freedom of the country both for political and religious reasons.[38]

He was a firm believer in the finality of Islamic laws and stood for the preservation of the '*sharia*'. He strongly opposed all efforts of the British government and Westernised Intelligentia to bring about changes in the Muslim Personal law through legislation. Besides his political and religious predilections he was primarily a teacher and head of the Deoband school.[39]

Maulana considered it a religious duty of Muslims to win *swaraj* (self rule) for India. As a result of prolonged exploitation the strength and good qualities of Muslims were exhausted. For political consideration, *swaraj* was as essential for Muslims as for any other community. Under the

British rule they could neither improve their condition internally nor support their members of society. Even if no other community worked for *swaraj*, the Muslims should work for it, he asserted.

He was of the view that Hindu-Muslim unity was vital for the country. Islam enjoined reliance on God even if after the attainment of *swaraj*, non Muslims deserted them. They need not worry and should rely on God alone. He believed that though differing in faith, the communities of India would remain united on fundamental issues. Maulana participated in all political movements that were launched in the country. He was often jailed for these involvements. The Maulana used to pass on secret information to them by writing on *silken handkerchiefs.* The conspiracy leaked out and the Maulana was arrested and jailed in Malta in 1914. After being released in 1919 he assumed the leadership of the Jamiat-ul-Ulama. During this period he collaborated with the Indian National Congress on the political plane. He courted arrest in civil-disobedience movement launched by Gandhiji in 1930 and again in 1932.[40]

Maulana headed the Jamiat-ul-Ulama and led it till the last breath of his life. Soon after the Lahore resolution was passed by Muslim League in March 1940, he helped in convening the Azad Muslim conference in April 1940 under the Sindh Premier Allah Bux and came out with resolutions rejecting the two-nation theory and the demand for Pakistan.[41]

In August 1942, the congress passed the famous “Quit India Movement” resolution. As a result of this, the congress leaders including Maulana were arrested and remained in jail through out the World War II. Lord Wavell brought from London a new proposal to resolve the deadlock in the efforts to reconciliation with India. On June 14 1945, all the members of the Congress working committee including Maulana were released from prison which came to be known as Wavell scheme. Leaders of congress and Muslim League gathered at Shimla for negotiation about transfer of power that went on for two weeks. The Wavell scheme contained in it the seeds of communal separation Mr. Jinnah had been given hints that if he took the position of representative of Muslim community and demanded a separate state for his community. The British would support his contention, infact, he had returned to Indian politics only after that hint though he had rejected separate Muslim state of Pakistan when a Cambridge student Rahmat Ali had first mooted it. As Wavell plan fail but it widened the gulf between Nationalist leaders and pro-league members it made divisions among Muslims also. Mr. Jinnah asked the Viceroy to promise that in the future constitutional setup the demand for separate state of Pakistan would be given recognition. Sanguine Muslim leaders shocked Jinnah’s attitude and because of his attitude Shimla conference was failed and it gave bad name to India that its leader was incapable of developing a consensus even on securing power from the British. The Jamiat ulama thought it

advisible in the circumstances to make it known that the claim of Mr. Jinnah was false.[42]

An urgent meeting of the working committee was convened at a short notice of three days and leaders of other Muslim organizations were also invited to participate. The meeting was held on June 28, 1945 with Maulana Madani in their chair. It adopted resolution that expressed satisfaction with the Wavell scheme and declared that Muslim League could not be treated as the sole representative of Muslim community to decide the names of their nominees in the transitional government proposed in the Wavell scheme. Maulana Azad as president of Indian National Congress convened the meeting of the Congress Working Committee. Maulana was invited as the common leader of all the nationalist organizations.

The congress sent to the viceroy a list of 15 names on July 6 but Mr. Jinnah still acting on the line of the British rules, raised objection and the viceroy declared the failure of the conference. On July 15, that is what the imperialist section of the British Government wanted because they had no intention of quitting India in accordance with the nationalist demand. The idea that India was not one nation was the part of the British 'Divide and Rule' policy.

The support of communist party of India to the Pakistan resolution could also have been a factor because it deprived congress of the possibility of support from the organized working class. This had created disruption in the unity of national movement. While this wrangling was on, election to the central and provincial assemblies were at hand. The electoral system at that time was based on separate communal electorate. Hindus and Muslims separately elected their representatives and in each house of municipality to the central assembly number of representatives of each community were fixed. The election was thus not between political parties but between two ideologies, The ideology of partition and that of united Nationhood it was however an unequal contest Muslim League had utilized the interval between 1937-44 when it had been roundly defeated and 1944 when the nationalist released from prison. For widening the communal gulf and bringing the Muslim mind under the utopian model of an independent state of Muslims, Pakistan League and Mr. Jinnah were confident that they would definitely succeed in the upcoming elections. Several times he expressed his over confidence that, he had liberated Muslim youth from the strangle hold of the ulama in a speech on March 16, 1945. He said at Queta, "Nationalist Muslims are not Muslims but bond slaves of Hindus". On April 13, 1945, Mr. Jinnah likened Maulana Azad and Maulana to Quisling. Mr. Chundrigar, a member of the league working committee said in Bombay on September 6, 1945 that nationalist parties were dancing girls, dancing to the

tunes of the congress. Jinnah tried to declare the Muslim participants of 'Quit India Movement' as the enemy of Quam (Muslims), perfidious and Hinduists.[43]

When Maulana was released from jail Muslims showed the same hour honour and dignity for him, but unfortunately he had no facilities for propaganda. Press and papers were under the control of league. The nationalist Muslims were facing the election in a situation where they were tied hand and foot in terms of press and platform. They were not free either to hold public meetings or to publish their views on a large enough. As against this the league papers were being published in all regalia. From Delhi alone about a dozen Urdu and English pro-league papers were being regularly published. League and its machinery strongly opposed Maulana and wrote unknown letters to active members of Jamiat-ul-ulama and nationalist Muslims which mentioned death threats to them. In a nutshell from Pishawar to Madras and from Bombay to Assam the whole Indian atmosphere was jeopardized.

Nationalist parties in every province and these parties considered league's policies as dangerous to Muslims but none of them was prepared to call them all for united action, such was the terror spread by Muslim league. Jamiat-ul-Ulama-e-Hind took the initiative for forging unity of nationalist parties to give united fight to Muslim league. It convened an

all parties meeting in which six parties were invited that is (1) All India Muslim Majlis which had been formed as an alternative to Muslim league. (2) Majlis-e-Ahrar Islam, well known for its sacrifies in the national cause. (3) All India Momin Conference (4) Khudai Kidmatgar (5) Independent party and (6) Krishak Praja Party. All these parties honestly felt that the policy of Muslim League would spell disaster for the Muslim community and deemed it their religious and national duty to fight against Muslim league. They welcomed the initiative and sent their delegations. Thus about 50 representatives of these organizations and more than a hundred of the Jamiat discussed the situation for three days from September 17 to 19 of 1945. After a detailed discussion a joint parliamentary board be set up to manage the Election. There was no such honest, faithful, active crusader like Maulana to preside this Independent Muslim parliamentary board; hence he was unanimously nominated as chairman. Maulana was persuaded to be its chairman. After assuming chairmanship, he explained the situation and the obligation of Muslim organizations through the long speech. The sum and substance of the speech is as follows :

> To point out what are desirable and what undesirable is the obligation of every Muslim and, in particular of the Islamic scholars. When Muslim rule ended in India the total Muslim population in the country was two and half crores. Within a

century this number has swelled to ten corers. The scholars have a major contribution in this expansion of population. Compassion and mercy, justice, public service and good human relations are the basic principles for propagation of Islam; it has spread because these principles have been adhered too.

We cannot propagate Islam by provoking hatred. Non-Muslim communities are the field for this work and its material. By provoking hatred among Hindus this field can be closed and the material finished. To confine the propagation of Islam to a particular area is contrary to the tradition and the compassion of the Prophet for entire mankind.

The gulf of hatred that is being created through the Pakistan scheme needs to be filled up so that propagation of Islam is not restricted to a particular area. Right of Muslims on every inch of this country has been established by the struggle and sacrifices of our ancestors. Its preservation and expansion is our duty and obligation today.

In the work of this parliamentary board the major contribution in every respect was made by Maulana. He was instrumental in collecting major part of funds for its. He wrote maximum literature and spent most

time in tours and addressing meetings. During 1945-46 election campaign Maulana delivered speeches in favor of nationalist Muslims candidates of congress. When he reached at Sayedpur and Bhagalpur stations pro league rowdies greeted the Maulana with dirtiest of abuses and most shameless behavior unworthy of any cultured society. The same behavior was repeated at all stations from Lahore to Ambala. At places there was brick batting and windowpanes were broken.

Apart from these prominent incidents there was violence against supporters of non- league candidates, their houses were set on fire and they were subjected to physical injuries. Non non-league non league candidate could be sure of the security of his person or property and all this was happening with connivance open and not so open, of the government law and order machinery.[44]

When India was liberated Maulana left everything but carried on his Teachings. Normally, what happens after a person takes part in a liberation struggle and they achieve their objective the issue of position and status beings to play its role. However, Maulana wasn’t interested in such things. If he wanted he could have received the highest position that any person could have received but Maulana left all that and went to *Dar-ul-uloom* Deoband and dedicated himself to teaching. When time came for distribution of awards and Honors to those who took part in the liberation

struggle, Maulana too was insisted. This was a very prestigious Honor whereby his name would have been elevated throughout the world. Yet Maulana declined. He refused to accept such an award. He explained his refusal by mentioning that this was against the tradition of our Predecessors. Thus Maulana put forth the prime example of sincerity. He took part in the struggle solely for the pleasure of Allah and his countrymen and not because of gaining a position in society.[45]

The sixth decade of this century faced the aggressive way of revival of Hindu culture and his struggle to merger the other culture in Hinduism and amnesty to destroy the identity and distinction of muslims but as the congress itself was the part of it, the complain of Jamiat were remain friendly protest. Jamiat never visualized the bitter results of declaring Hindu and Muslim as one nation. He decided to face these problems through religions. Preach and publication. In 1957, Jamiat kept away itself from politics and decide to face this situation through spreading Islamic education and to provide it to Muslims respectable means of livelihood with religious education and traditions.

Jamiat-ul-ulama organised different Islamic conferences for this purpose, in 1952 at Ahmadabad, in 1955 Allahabad, Khalilabad, Mumbai, Ujjain, Meraj, Palanpur etc. Maulana inaugurated Islamic educational convention in Mumbai the nobles from all Muslim groups

participated in this conference and constituted. "All India Islamic educational Board" this board planned to boycott the text books of government schools which preached Hinduism. In the 4th session of Jamiat in 1955 Maulana said, Jamiat had a keen desire to welcome modern educational system in the country and it also wants to impart religious education to our children as to make them able to fulfill the expectation of Islam and our country.

In 1956 Maulana presided over Annual session of Jamiat at Surat Maulana regret upon the problem of Urdu, decreasing proportion of Muslims in government jobs and deteriorating economic condition and demanded the restoration of Mosques and Aukaaf. Maulana counseled Muslims to take active part in the progress and development of the country through five year plan.[46]

Maulana was not part of free India's power structure but the powers that, he had high regard for him. His request was treated as an irrefutable demand because sincerity of his approach and veracity of his information could never be doubted. Maulana did not cherish power but power cherished Maulana. Several instances can be given to support this contention. Here is an instance.

1. The first President of free India Dr.Rajendra Prasad expressed his desire to visit Maulana at Dar-ul- Uloom. People in-charge of his security tried to dissuade him because, in their opinion, the small town would not make available the medical aid that an asthma patient like him might require in an emergency. But the President insisted and did pay a visit.

    Probably at his instance the Government had proposed to award *Padma Vibhushan* to Maulana. The proposal appeared in the press. When Maulana heard about it he wrote to the President :

    Although I have not received any official invitation I have come to know from newspapers that there is a proposal to honour me with Padma Vibhushan in recognition of my services to the country and in my position as president of Jamiat-ul- Ulama and as a teacher. Whereas I am grateful for such consideration I am of the opinion that such an award would adversely affect the right to free expression of opinion by public servants in the eyes of public and thus it would create a sort of obstruction in correcting and guiding the national government. Therefore I deem it not proper to accept the award.

2. Several ministers of the government came to pay their respects at the Dar-ul -Uloom. Once Railway Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri came and sat among the audience. Maulana wanted him to occupy a higher seat but Shastriji replied,

> Probably you have forgotten that during the prison days I used to sit like this in the audience. Today also I would prefer to be seated in the same fashion.

Mahavir Tyagi, the Minister of Defence Production and Rafi Ahmad Kidwai, the Communications Minister also showed similar reverence.

3. Pandit Govind Vallabh Pant, the Chief Minister of U.P., once on tour to Deoband sent word that he would like to visit but the Maulana expressed inability to receive him because of prior preoccupation. Despite that Pandit Pant came and joined the afternoon gathering in which anybody could come without prior engagement.[47]

Maulana Abdussalaam Kidwai wrote:

> During the period of Maulana Habib-ur-rehman Usmani when, after the great strike in Deoband, eminent personalities like Maulana Anwar Shah, Mufti Aziz-ur-rehman and Maulana

> Shabbir Ahmad Usmani quit Dar-ul-Uloom. The entire episode remained in newspaper headlines for quite some time; indeed, some papers were launched specifically for this controversy. It was a dangerous strike and it was feared that the result of our forbears half century's hard labor might not be reduced to dust. But God saved the institution. On the one hand, Maulana Husain Ahmad agreed to take over the responsibility to head the teaching faculty and the department of *Hadith* and, on the other hand, some people of goodwill invited Shah Saheb and his associates to launch a seminary at Dabhil (Gujarat).

About Maulana's impact, former manager of Nadwat-ul-Ulama, Lucknow, Maulana Abdul Hai worte :

> In 1346 A.H. when Allama Anwar Shah Kashmiri resigned as head of *Hadith* department at Dar-ul-Uloom, Maulana Husain Ahmad was selected to take his place. He carried on the teaching of *Hadith* with equal competence and dignity so that Dar-ul-Uloom retained its reputation and centrality and people's confidence would be restored. Along with teaching work the Maulana continued the political struggle with his usual courage and determination, thus creating and awakening among Muslims the spirit of freedom and self-respect.[48]

Tarachand, a well-known historian wrote,

> "He held that people of India irrespective of religious differences ought to form a united nation in order to secure Independence and pursue the policies of common welfare."[49]

Dr. Rafiq Zakaria, author and politician wrote,

> "One of the tallest among the religious leaders of the early forties was Maulana Husain Ahmed Madni. He had advised Muslims against partition, reminding them that the Prophet himself had preached and practiced the virtues of united, composite nationhood, when he ruled Madina. The harm that division had done to both Hindus and Muslims should be an eye opener for all those who believed that hate can be the substitute for love and distrust and enmity can be more potent than trust and friendship".[50]

Barbara Daly Metcalf described Husain Ahmed Madni in her book (Husain Ahmed Madni, The Jihad for Islam and India's Freedom. Oxford Oneworld 2009) that, he was a political activist, Islamic Scholar and supporter of Gandhi during the struggle for India's independence. Immersed in Islamic scholarship from an early age, he sought to apply Muslim teaching to the urgent issues of his day. Humane and fiercely dedicated whether

campaigning against the separation of Pakistan, or in favour of democracy and inter-religious peace, he fought relentlessly for what he believed in.

Maulana Husain Ahmed breath his last at Deoband on December 5, 1957 on Tuesday (18 Rabi-ul-Awwal 1339 H), with him passed a glorious era.[51]

REFERENCES :

1. Z.M. Khan (Ed) 100 great Muslim Leaders of the 20th Century, Intro. P - xxiv, published by Institute of objective studies, New Delhi. India.

2. Jim Masselos (1985), Indian Nationalism – An History, PP.1-2, Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi-110016.

3. Maulana Mohd. Abbas Shaad (Ed), Bartanvi Samraj ne hamein kaise loota written by Maulana Husain Ahmed Madni, P-9., published by Farid Book Depot, New Delhi.

4. Ibid., P-38.

5. R.C.Majumdar, studies in the cultural history of India (1960), PP.295-296, Published by Shivalal Agarwal & Co. Pvt. Ltd., Agra-3.

6. Ibid P.297.

7. Ibid PP.299-300, 296.

8. Op.cit., Maulana Mohd. Abbas Shaad (Ed), PP.21-22.

9. Tara Chand, History of India, Vol.IV (Introduction), P – v, Published by Publications Division, Ministry of Information and broadcasting, Govt. of India.

10. Husain Ahmed Madani, Naqsh-e-Hayat (1999), Vol.I. P.185, Maktaba Diniyat Deoband.

11. Op.cit., Maulana Mohd. Abbas Shaad (Ed), P.48.

12. Op.cit., R.C. Majumdar P.296.

13. Op.cit., *Naqsh-e-Hayat*, Vol. I, PP.186-187.

14. V.D. Mahajan, Modern Indian History (1988), P.9, S.Chand and Company Pvt. Ltd., also see, E.W. Thomson, History of India; PP.242-243; Shrishti Book Distributors, Daryaganj, New Delhi.

15. Tara Chand, History of India, Vol.2, P.1, The Director Publications Ministry of Information and Broad Casting, Government Of India, Patiala House, New Delhi.

16. Op.cit., Maulana Mohd. Abbas Shaad (Ed), PP.63-65.

17. Op.cit., V.D. Mahajan (1988) Chapter II, P - xxxviii

18. Ibid P.x1ix

19. Ibid P.1iv

20. Op.cit., Naqsh-e-Hayat, Vol. P.189.

21. Op.cit. V.D. Mahajan (1988) P.659.

22. Ibid. P.656

23. Ibid. P.659

24. Jagdish Saran Sharma, India, Since the Advent of British P. (Introduction) xviii, Published by S.Chand and Co., Ramnagar, New Delhi – 55.

25. Mewaram Gupt Saturiya, *Hidustan ki Jange Aazadi Ke Musalman Mujahedeen* 1815-1947 (December 1988) PP. 105-106.

26. D.R. Goyal, Husain Ahmad Madani, A Biographical Study, P. (Preface) published by Anamika Publishers and Distributors, Daryaganj, New Delhi 110002.

27. Ibid P.27.

28. Mohd. Salman Mansoorpuri, *Tehrike Aazadi-e-Hind mein Muslim Ulema Aur Awam Ka Kirdar* (2000) P.92 pub. By Zam Zam Book Depot, Deoband, Saharanpur, U.P.

29. Op.cit. *Naqsh-e-Hayat,* (1999) PP.17-18.

30. Op.cit D.R. Goyal, P.31

31. Op.cit. 100 Great Muslim Leaders of the 20th Century. P.215.

32. Op.cit. D.R. Goyal, PP.14 -16.

33. Op.cit. 100 Great Muslim Leaders of the 20th Century. PP.215-216.

34. Maulana Mohd. Miya Sahab, *Aseeran-e-Malta,* 2002, P.19 Published by Kutubkhana Naimya, Deoband.

35. Op.cit. 100 Great Muslim Leaders of the 20th Century. P.129

36. Op.cit. D.R. Goyal, PP.88-89

37. ibid PP 92-93.

38. Op.cit. 100 Great Muslim Leaders of the 20th Century. PP.215-216.

39. Encyclopedia of Muslim Biography Vol.III Edited by Rajendra Kumar Singh P.142 published by A.P.H. Publishing Corporation, 5, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi – 110002.

40. Farooq Argali, *Fakhr-e-Watan*, 2011, PP.323-324 Published by Farid Book Depot, Pvt. Ltd., Daryaganj, New Delhi..

41. Op.cit. Mewaram Gupt Saturya (1998) PP.105-106

42. Maulana Sayyed Mohd. Miya Sahab, Ulama-e-Haq aur unke Mujahedana Karname (2008) Vol. II PP. 194-201, Faisal Publishing, Jama Masjid, Deoband.

43. Ibid PP 206-212.

44. Ibid PP 213-221.

45. Op.cit. 100 Great Muslim Leaders of the 20th Century, P.129.

46. Dr. Sayyad Abdul Bari, Azad Hindustan mein Muslim Tanzeeme Ek jaiza.PP 99-100, Institute of objective studies, New Delhi.

47. Op.cit. D.R. Goyal, PP 241-242.

48. Op.cit. D.R. Goyal , p-135.

49. Tara Chand (1972), History of Freedom Movement in India, P.256, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi.

50. Dr. Rafiq Zakaria, The Man Who Divided India, (2001) P.XII (preface) Published by Ramdas Bhadkal for Popular Prakashan.

51. Op.cit. 100 Great Muslim Leaders of the 20th Century, P.129.

CHAPTER – 2

MUSLIMS
AND
INDIAN NATIONALISM

If congruence between culture and power is what nationalism is about within the overall context of social change, this congruence has two aspects : one, the movement towards a homogeneous spread of power over culture, leading to the becoming of a modern nation and the formal affirmation within a nation-state through the notions of citizenship and territoriality; two, the movement to wrest power from the alien culture and reinvest it in one's own. What is crucially national then, is, that there exists a congruence between these two aspects themselves. Nationalism is thus a complex of congruence between power and culture. The principle that power should be congruous with one's own culture itself can be viewed in two ways: either as resistance to the threat of existing congruence, or as a struggle to regain lost congruence, accompanied with the concomitant attempt to refit culture-power relations in a specifically modern way.[1]

The overall impact of colonial rule on the hierarchical society had been to bring together similarly positioned castes and communities in the social structure, and to widen the already existing cleavage between the higher and lower castes, thus initiating a process of double horizontal polarization. Such a transformation, depicted above in ideal-typical fashion reproduced itself in political consciousness, which was similarly seen to be largely dichotomous or disjuncted. Within the sociological paradigm of nationalism as congruence between culture and power, the two strands of consciousness represented the two aspects of congruence-one, of the lower castes, tribals and largely Muslim masses.[2]

Nationalism in contemporary India was a new phenomenon. The concept and the ideal of Indian nationalism was forged by those who felt the need of "revaluation of the values" and the discovering of the Indian identity vis-à-vis the Western culture and civilization. It represents a dialectical process as it at once included the revivalist and the reformist attitudes. Nationalism in India can thus be described as the consciousness and the recognition of the socio-cultural synthetic unity in the past. It was more than a spiritual urge because it had to operate as a mechanism of funneling out the aspirations and the hopes of the educated middle class. The positive contributory aspects of the British Raj and the work of the Orientalists gave a new content and dimension to it.[3]

According to Boyd Shafer men do not become nationalist because of biology. They are not born nationalists. They acquire national consciousness and become national patriots because the political, economic and social conditions and thought of their time make them so.[4]

"… to our ancestors, who lived under the British rule even a century and a half ago, India in this sense (as a national and political unit) had no meaning and no existence. They talked of the Sikhs, Rajputs, Marathis, Hindustanis, Bengalis, Oriyas, Tamils etc., but had no clear conception of an Indian. We learn from Bishop Herber, who widely traveled over North India in 1824, that the people in U.P. regarded the Bengalis as much a foreigner as the English. In spite of the slogan of 'Hindu Pad Padshahi' the Marathis had ravaged without compunction the territories of the Sikhs and Rajputs on the West, the Bengalis in the East, the Tamils and Kannadas in the South, and the Hindustanis in the North. To a Bengali the Marathas were not only as much a foreigner as the English, but they were hated foreigners. The Marathas tried to form an alliance with the English in order to ravage Bengal. The Bengalis requited it by offering prayers and thanks giving to God at each successive victory of the British against the Marathas and other Indian peoples. The conception of India, as a whole, was to be found only in the literary works of a past age, and still survived in

theory, but it has no application to actual politics till the sixties and seventies of the 19th century'.[5]

. Nationalism in India manifested the desire to increase the strength, liberty and prosperity of the Indian people. It aimed to achieve the unification of Indian citizens upon the basis of country's political interests and aspirations, irrespective of religion, race, caste or creed, and the inclusion of the masses in the great public movement of the day. This feeling of common nationalist was based on common tradition, common disabilities, and common hopes and aspirations.'[6]

Macaulay was mostly responsible for introducing the new educational policy in India. His object was to train bring up Indians in the Western manner and method and to bring the two peoples British and Indian, socially, culturally and politically closer.

The English language proved a blessing in disguise for Indians in many ways. Through the vehicle of the English language, the vast English literature, which is full of democratic ideas and freedom-songs become accessible to Indians. It infused in them a new love for liberty and freedom, ideas of Milton, Burke, Mill, Macaulay, Herbert. Spencer and many others were made available to them. It enabled Indians to go abroad and to live among Englishmen and other Western nations. When Indians went abroad,

they saw the way in which freemen of the world lived. They also studied for themselves the working of democratic political institution when these men return to India. The life here proved simply suffocating and revolting to them. Again the English language served as a ‘lingua franca’ i.e. as the common all-India language. It was through the medium of the English language that seventy two educated Indians from every nook and corner of the country, could exchange their ideas in 1885 in Bombay for the first time, with the set purpose of evolving a national organization for the country as a whole for the first fifteen years or so the national movement was confined to those who had learnt and mastered the English language and were brought up essentially in the Western style.[7] Long before Salisbury had warned that the newly educated Indians cannot be anything else than an opposition in quiet times, Rebels in time of trouble. Lord Salisbury’s fear was genuine Western education acquainted the Indian’s with the progressive Political theories of Bentham. J.S. Mill, Rousseau, Spencer and created a ferment in India. The revolutions and liberalism of the 19th Centruy Europe quickened the national upsurge and inspired the Indians to demand for the application of those liberal Principles in India.

Political awakening in India was not an isolated event. It bore the impact of similar movements of the world. “India’s awakening” Tagore rightly observed “is part of the world awakening.” In Europe it was in the

19th Century that Germany and Italy attained National unification. In England, this century witnessed the movements for parliamentary reforms. All these exercise a healthy influence upon the minds of Indians and invigorated in the Indian people a spirit to ask for the reforms that were taking place in England. The influence of young Turk movement, the victory of Japan in the Russo-Japanese War, the introduction of representative institutions in colonies like New South Walves, New Zealand, New Found land Barbados and in the Philippines, the Chinese Revolution of 1911, the rise of Sinn Fein Movement in Ireland and the Russian Revolutions of 1905 and 1917.[8]

The ultimate aim of Nationalism is to lift a Nation economically, socially and politically. In a subject country nationalism becomes synonyms with patriotism and its immediate objective is the achievement of national sovereignty or independence, because foreign rule proved to be a hurdle in the way of the advancement of a subject country[9] The obstacles and challenges to the growth of this concept of nationalism were varied and many. The caste ridden infrastructure of society and the absence of the adequate means of communication could not develop national will and produce national consciousness. Besides, there existed developed languages and cultures and no lingua franca. Unlike the West, the feudal rule in India was incapable of creating representative institutions like Parliament

and promoting the ideas of liberty. Perhaps a long period-a thousand years-of feudal disintegration wiped out any national consciousness that could have emerged. The want of homogeneity, the presence of diversified historical traditions and appeal based on religion provided a fertile soil for the harvest of religio-cultural nationalism. Instead of materializing the unity of sentiment through an unadulterated political movement, cultural nationalism was made a divine cult. The superiority of Hindu religion and culture over other religions and cultures was asserted. The attitude of intolerance of, if not virulent antagonism to, other religious systems, particularly the Muslims, was adopted. The progressive measures of the British government were opposed. History was perverted and studied with a communal outlook. "National" heroes were rediscovered.[10]

F.K.Khan Durrani is no wrong in his statement that neither the Hindus nor the Muslims of the pre-British period possessed a national consciousness.

They fought neither for dynasties nor for causes or nations. Again had they been a nation, the British could have been conquered India but, a continent, traditions, social culture moral consciousness and psychological make-up. The orthodox Hindu masses started efforts for the Hindu revivalism and consequently in 1838, the Pharma Sabha was founded by Kashi Prasad Ghosh in order to protect the time honoured Hindu social

customs and religious practices. On the other hand the Muslims were equally keen to start an equally strong revivalist movement.[11] Socio-religious reform movements appeared on the intellectual firmament of India a number of socio-religious reformers who injected a spirit of self-cirticism in the Indians by reminding them of their glorious and proud heritage. They were Raja Ram Mohan Roy, the founder of Aryasamaj, Ramkrishna Paramhansa, Vivekananda and Mrs. Annie Besant. Drawing inspiration from India's past they educated the Indians through their writings and speeches and inspired them to try to lift their country from its present state of degeneration to one of honour and glory which it had in the past.[12]

The growth of nationalism in India was the result of the interaction and intermingling of various factors-social, religious, cultural, political economic and spiritual racial and of the Western and Eastern, the foreign and indigenous origin. Indian Nationalism had both an element of response and challenge. It was a challenge to British domination of India and it was a response in so far as India derived her inspiration from Western learning and liberalism. The alien rule itself was basically responsible for the growth of Indian Nationalism. In a sense, political awakening in India was a natural reaction against the aggressive British imperialism and oppressive British Rule. Despite the declaration 1833 and Queen's Proclamation of 1858 that Indians would be given better treatment and would not be discriminated

against, nothing was done to give better treatment to them Higher services remained the close preserve of the Europeans. As late as 1915 only five percent of the posts of the Superior Civil Services were occupied by Indians. The security of the empire rested on the civil services and therefore Indians were not entrusted with responsible post.

Furthermore, the British Government was an autocracy tempered by the rule of law but governing without any system of representation, as the time passes it declared that self-rule or representative government was not meant for Indians. Sir Henry Maine could see no place for representative institutions in India. Lytton wrote to Sir E. Perry on April 18, 1877, "we hold India as a conquered country……… which must be governed in all essentials by the strong hand of the conquering power." British government considered Indians as unsuitable for important and responsible administrative posts. Bernard Houghton very rightly pointed out that bureaucratic governments in India, whether imperial or provincial, by their determined opposition to the demands of the people for a share in the government of the land, had aroused a spirit of patriotism, a will for self-sacrifice, a zeal for the greatness of their country.

A vital factor which aroused the people of India was racial discrimination of the British Rule which was imbued with strong consciousness of colour and nationality British people considered they are

superior to the Indian and non-official Englishmen in India despised the Indians. Indians were termed as “nigger” and the Europeans masters’ perpetrated severe cructies on the natives. Even the middle and the lower classes of Europeans in India considered themselves a Sahib. Sir William Russell had mentioned numerous cases of ill treatment and humiliation of Indians. Charles Dike, who made a trip to India in 1867, also admitted that the conduct of non-official Englishman in India was highly distressing.

Sir Henry cotton mentioned the abuses, insults and assaults hurled upon the native population by the British Officials as well as non-officials and painted out that the more educated the Indian, the more he was disliked by Englishmen, for he wanted to be treated as an equal by those who were taught to regard themselves as gentlemen engaged in the magnificent work of “Governing and inferior race.” Such an attitude created a wide gulf between the natives and the foreigners.[13]

The birth of Indian press and Vernacular literature fed the rising flame of Indian Nationalism, Rajaram Mohan Roy, the father of the Indian press founded a weekly paper ‘Sambad Kanmudi. The Bombay samachar, the Bunga Datta, the Bengalee, Indian Mirror the comrade, the Hindu patriot the Keshari, the New India were some of important newspapers and journals, which were published at about that time. The Indians thus got the hance to propogate their feelings and grievances with the result that the

people were politically educated. Thus, the press served as a powerful instrument in preparing the growth of Nationalism. There emerged a group of writers in Bengal, prominent Rabindranath Tagore and Keshav Chandra Sen, Bankim Chandra's Novel, Ananda Math and poem 'Vande Mataram, Tagore's Jana-gana-mana, Iqbal's Sare Jaha se Achha' contributed a lot to providing a momentum to the development of national conciousness.[14]

The modern period in the history of India begins from the time when British rule took firm roots in the country and modern Western civilization began to exercise a deep influence upon the life of its people. In Western and Southern India this great change had already come about in the beginning of the nineteenth century as the collapse of the Maratha power and that of Tipu Sultan had put an end to all organized opposition to the British and cleared the way for their government and their culture in the country. But in North India it took them another 50 or 60 years to establish their political and cultural domination as firmly as in the souther and western parts of the country. In Western and Southern India both the Hindus and Muslims had, generally speaking, given a positive response to the challenge of the new age without giving up their religious and cultural traditions and had started to learn the English language and Western sciences.[15]

In Southern and Western India most of the educated Muslims of the higher and middle classes were descendants of Arab sailors and traders

who had settled down on the Malabar and Coromandal coasts in the seventh, eighth and later centuries. There were also some families of religious scholars and others who had come from North India during the mediaeval period and had served the Mughal Empire or the local Muslim states like Mysore and Carnatic. But there was no large feudal class dominating the intellectual and cultural life of Muslims in the South as there was in North India. Muslim traders always lived as peaceful citizens and contributed to the prosperity of the region which they had made their home. Their relations with the Hindu rulers and their Hindu fellow-subjects were, on the whole, good. In the sixteenth century they had to surrender much of their business to the Portuguese and to content themselves with a small portion of inland and overseas trade. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries they had seen the English engaging themselves in military and political contests with the Portuguese and other European nations as well as with the Indian rulers and winning their way to the political domination of the country.[16]

So far as the religious class of the *ulama* and the *Sufis* is concerned, they hated Western culture even more intensely than the classes mentioned above. This was due to various religious, economic, cultural and social motives. They regarded the English, in spite of all their claims to religious impartiality, as the enemies of Islam and the friends and patrons of Christianity. They thought, not without reason, that the English Government

was a danger to their religion. The schools teaching English and modern sciences were still in the hands of Christian missionaries. The Bishop of Calcutta had in 1818 set up an institution to train Christian missionaries in which Hindus and Muslims were also admitted, which were quite frequent, to take custody of Hindu and Muslim children who had no one to care for them, and bring them up as Christians.[17]

Moreover, though the British had received the *Diwani* of Bengal from the Mughal Emperor on the condition that they would maintain the Islamic judicial system, they had, as soon as they found themselves powerful enough, put an end to all religious tribunals and established civil courts in which all the higher officials were British and the lower officials mostly Bengali Hindus. This hurt both the religious susceptibility and the economic interests of the Muslim *ulama*, for it was they who generally filled the posts of *qazis* and *muftis* in religious tribunals and who now found themselves out of work.[18] Besides, the traditional primary schools or *maktabs* in which *maulvis* educated in religious seminaries found employment as teachers were also being abolished. At the same time the deplorable condition of the mass of the people especially that of cultivators and artisans, under the Government of the East India Company, was economically disastrous and emotionally distressing for the *ulama*. Because, unlike the higher and middle classes who regarded the masses as an object of

exploitation, the class of *ulama* that was not associated with the royal court had close contacts with the common people as their religious teachers and guides and sympathized with them as their brother-in-faith. They in their turn were devoted to the *ulama* and gave them voluntary financial subsidies. Particularly, those among the independent *ulama,* who were associated with the puritanic reform movements, were bitter enemies of the British Government.[19]

Indians in general had a bitter grievance against the foreign rulers because they regarded them as an inferior race and avoided social contacts with them. Thus one can understand how resentful these Muslim *ulama* must have been, who had so far enjoyed high social status and had now, owing to the contemptuous attitude of the Government, fallen in the estimation of worldly-minded people. So far as Western culture, which associated with it was hateful in the eyes of the *ulama*, which looked as it from outside and from a great distance. Its secular character, they regarded as irreligious.[20] Shahwaliullah of Delhi (1703 A.D. - 1762 A.D.) lived during the decline of the Mughal empire but before Indian Islam had felt the impact of Western thought. A *Sufi* of the *Naqshbandi* order, his aim was to check the spiritual and political decline of Islamic India. He became a very important source for Islamic social and political thought in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in India and Pakistan. He was a luminary, who during the

stormy period of political conciousness among Indians, showed a true mystic path, the path of peace and glory. He was possessed of deep insight, profound learing and heroic nobleness this philosophy gave rise to a mighty movement under the leadership of Shah Ismail Shahid and Sayyed Ahmed Barelvi for Muslims liberation from Western imperialism.

Shah Waliullah's philosophy brought radical change in the outlook of the Muslim community in various walks of life that a mighty movement came up under the leadership of Shah Ismail Shahid's and Sayyed Ahmed Barelvi. His philosophical effort forced the Muslim community to realize the condition in which they had been left through a neglect of their faith, or through a incorrect to it. They sprang up an ardent desire in the minds of the Muslims to retrive their position not merely to claim the heritage of their past culture, but also to revive the vitality inherent in it.[21]

In Bengal it was Nawab Abdul Latif who tried to pull them out of their pitiful plight. In 1863 he found the Mohammadan Literary Society in Calcutta. The Society aimed at persuading the higher and middle class Muslims to study the English language and Western sciences so as to enlighten their mind, widen their outlook. The movement started by Nawab Abdul Latif was limited in its object as well as in its scope. A comprehensive movement of religious, cultural and political reform and progress, which was to have its impact on the higher and middle classes of

Muslim throughout Northern India and initiate an intellectual revolution among them was started by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan.

During the first half of the 19th century the attitude of the Muslims towards the British was hostile. The Wahabi movement and the Mutiny of 1857-58 convinced the government that the Muslims were inimical to the British Raj. The British were so distrustful of the Muslims that all over the North-Western provinces a Mohammedan was another word for a rebel.[22] They were held responsible for the revolt of 1857. Sir Alfred Lyall testifies to this fact in these words.

"The English turned fiercely on the Mohammedans as upon their real enemies and most dangerous rivals. So, that the failure of the revolt was much more disastrous to them than to the Hindus. The Mohammedans, at last almost, all their remaining prestige of traditionary superiority over Hindus. They forfeited for the time the confidence of their foreign rulers and it is from this period that must be dated the lost of their numerical majority in the higher subordinate ranks of the civil and military service. In such embarrassing circumstances, Sir Sayed Ahmed Khan gave serious thoughts to the steps to be taken for the well-being of the Indian Muslims. He arrived at the conclusion that the progress of Muslims was not possible unless they were in the confidence of the British government.[23] But soon the policy of tables turned and the policy of hostility gave way to the policy of

reconciliation in bringing the Muslims closer to the British Government, and in weaning the government from its policy of suppression to one a paternalism and in creating a new awakening among the Muslims. W.W. Hunter and Sir Sayyed Ahmed Khan played the significant role. W.W. Hunter in his famous book entitled "Indian Mussalmans" pointed out that the anti-Muslim policy of the government had alienated the Indian Muslims who were simmering anti British feeling and pleaded for a more lenient attitude towards the Muslims to make them loyal to the British Raj.

The man who awakened the Muslims to Western learning and who infused vigour in the Muslim community was Sir Sayed Ahmed Khan. A new Association was born in Calcutta in 1878 with Syed Amir Ali as the secretary. The Association was formed with the object of promoting the well being of the Mussalmans of India. The Association had 54 branches preading all over India. In 1888, significant feature of the Association was the Hindu leaders like Surendra Nath Benerjee, Ramesh Chandra Mitter, W.C. Benerjee were the Honorary members of the association. The association asked for a proportion of jobs to be reserved for the Muslims and co-operated with other leaders on the question of the Ilbert Bill. Amir Ali joined the Hindu members in the imperial legislative council to support the Ilbert Bill.

The Central Mohammedan Association did not like the congress attitude of uneasiness towards the government and became hostile

to the programme of the congress for representative institutions which they thought, would lead to the political extinction of the Mohammedans. Amir Ali and Abdul Latif refused to take part in the congress session held at Calcutta in 1886.[24] Indian National Congress was neither formed under any national feeling nor was it interested in the problems of the common man. In the beginning the purpose of the organization was to understand the anger and the revolutionary feeling of the Indian people and to be informed of the revolutionary activities and plans of the Indians, through the meetings of the organization. In its early years, it did not aim at complete severance of India's connection with England. Unswerving loyalty to the British Crown wrote by Wedderburn, was to be the key-note of the institution, and the aim of the congress was to educate the Indian people into a genuine parliamentary frame of the mind. The early congressmen merely wanted to liberalise the British Rule and to get certain political and constitutional reforms. It is surprising that the congress in its early years was an association which aimed at political and constitutional concessions and was loyal to the British Raj.[25]

The liberal Muslims (Badruddin Tyabji, R.M. Sayani, Nawab Syed Mohammed, A. Rasul, Shaikh Raza Husain, Mazharul Haq, M.A. Jinnah upto 1920-43 garded themselves as Indians first and Muslims afterwards. They declared that "it is not the Muslims but their official master who are opposed to the Congress." "This liberal tradition was carried

forward by men like Hakim Ajmal Khan, Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani, Dr. M.A. Ansari, and Maulana Azad. They found no contradiction between Islam and Indian nationalism. They denounced "narrow religion" believing that "theological subtleties" should not be allowed to complicate modern political issues. They stood for supplying social and economic content to the political concept of independence of the country.[26] Like the liberal Muslims, Sir Syed agreed that political life of the people should not be governed by religious considerations. He also felt the need of reorienting the religion of Islam. He also realized that the backwardness of the Muslim community could be done away with through the cooperation between the rulers and the ruled. Like Badruddin Tyabji, he gave utmost importane to the educational advancement of the Muslims. Notwithstanding this, Sir Syed did not make a common cause either with the liberal Muslims or with the Indian National Congress. It is true that Sir Syed's opposition to the congress involved certain basic issues.

Sir Syed used the word "nation" to denote the people. All the Indians thus constitute one single nation. He used the word "Hindus" also in a broader sense. He who lives in India is a "Hindu". Sir Syed also held that existence of different religions does not militate against the essential unity of the people. According to him, "Hindus" and Muslim" are religious denominations, and India could build up a common composite culture. In

one of his speeches he said that India was the native land of both Hindus and Muslims, both drank the holy water of the Ganges; both wear the same colour. Muslims have borrowed hundreds of customs from the Hindus; Hindus also acquired many habits from the Muslims. This process of assimilation gave birth to a new language, Urdu. Therefore, the preservation and strength of Hindu-Muslim unity is the primary condition for the welfare and progress of both. The Hindus and the Muslims of India, he said, were the two beautiful and charming eyes of the bride.[27]

The ideal of Hindu-Muslim unity and the attitude towards the British government should have brought Sir Syed closer to the Indian National Congress. He himself gave the reasons for the opposition to the Congress. He held that the aims and objects of the Indian National Congress are based upon ignorance of history and present day realities; they do not take into consideration that India is inhabited by different nationalities; they presuppose that the Muslims, the Marathas, the Brahmins, the Sudras, the Sikhs, the Bengalees, the Madrasis and the Peshwaris all should be treated exactly alike and all of them belong to the same culture. The Congress conducted itself on the complacent assumption that all Indians profess the same religion, speak the same language, have the same way of life, that their attitude to history is similar and is based upon the same historical traditions. For the successful running of a democratic government it is essential that the

majority should have the ability to govern not only themselves but also unwilling minorities. According to Sir Syed, “the Congress is in reality a civil war without arms” and a machinery devised by the Hindus to further their own interests at the cost of the Muslims.

Sir Syed’s opposition to the Congress is considered to be a source of two-nation theory, Muslim separatism and communal-oriented Muslim politics. But here certain points should not be ignored.

Sir Syed earnestly felt that the Indian National Congress would be equally harmful to the Hindus. He believed that since the Bengalees were more advanced in education, they would be in a dominating position. Sir Syed took the initiative in the formation of the anti-Congress organization in 1888. But what is important is that the United Indian Patriotic Association was composed of the Muslims as well as Hindus. He was obviously not motivated by communal considerations.

Secondly, Sir Syed knew that India lacked homogeneity. Therefore, the functioning of democracy would not be as smooth as in England. The Congress was indifferent to the obstacles to democracy and growth of composite nationalism in India. Sir Syed stressed on the difficulties more in order to safeguard the interests of the minorities.

Lastly, Sir Syed thought that due to the educational backwardness, the Muslims lacked sufficient political consciousness. Moreover, it was no use supporting the Congress as there was no sound middle class among them. And in Sir Syed's mind, the Congress was not a mass organization but representative of the interests of the middle class. He wanted to take no risk by supporting the Congress in view of the consequences of 1857 and the North Indian politics.[28] The religious nationalists regarded secular nationalism as a Western ideal. It is essentially a western concept which undermines the vitality of Islam and Islamic polity. According to them nationalism treats man not as a part of humanity but as a member of a particular country set against other countries. The religious nationalists were not concerned with the freedom of the country. Maulana Maudoodi held those who were fighting for the freedom of the country were not on "the right path" as expounded by Islam. According to him, what was needed was the righteousness of viewpoint which was wanting in the national movement. Since the object of freedom struggle was not Islamic, the participation of the people was prohibited by religion. Nationalism and Communism were not considered different from Shuddhi and *Sangathan*.

The religious nationalists also thought that nationalism in India would destroy "cultural nationality" and ultimately "hurl down the whole country into the inferno of moral degeneration." Besides, through

nationalism, Hindu culture would be imposed on the minorities. The religious nationalists, therefore, felt that the nature of differences between the Hindus and Muslims was not “communal” but “international”.

Maulana Maudoodi opposed the demand of Pakistan as sovereignty of people and not the sovereignty of God would be the basis of polity. He, therefore, characterized the entire Pakistan movement as un-Islamic. Pakistan would be positively harmful to the solidarity and the expansion of Islam.[29] (K.K. Gangadharan Edi. 1972).

Iqbal (1873-1938), one of the greatest minds that Muslim India produced, started his life as a poet and teacher but later turned into a lawyer and politician. What he aimed at was to use the magic of his poetry for freeing the minds of the eastern peoples, especially Muslims, from the state of mental stagnation, listlessness and inaction and arousing in them self-confidence, self-respect, courage and determination and the will to live and act. A deep sentiment of patriotism, which led him to regard ‘each particle of the homeland dust as a god’ and an intense desire for national unity which urged him to believe that ‘the salvation of the people of India lay in love,’ were the most prominent characteristics of his personality and poetry. During his stay in Europe while writing his Ph.D. thesis on the *Development of Metaphysics in Persia* he studied the ideas of Muslim *Sufis* and came to the conclusion that the doctrine of unitism or *wahdat-ul-wujud* was definitely

un-Islamic and largely responsible for the decline of Muslim society.[30] For Iqbal nationalism in the sense of patriotism is a part of Muslim's faith, but as a political concept it is against Islam. According to him, nationalism as a political concept relegates Islam into the background "as a mere private opinion." In this sense religion and nationalism cannot go together. He makes a distinction between nationalism in Muslim majority countries and nationalism in Muslim minority countries. In the majority countries Islam and nationalism are practically identical while in the minority countries it tends to seek self-determination as a cultural unit.

Describing India as Asia in miniature Iqbal refers to its cultural diversity and its affinities to the Eastern and Western cultures. He holds that India, in the absence of "an effective principle of cooperation" has suffered much "more because of her situation in historic space than because of any inherent incapacity of her people". However, all attempts to evolve such a principle have failed. He regrets that India failed to carry on the lead given by Kabir and the divine faith of Akbar. According to him the reason for this failure is the suspicion towards each other's intentions and tendencies to dominate each other. Hence Iqbal holds that the only basis of permanent settlements of communal problem is the free development of Muslims on the basis of religion and culture.[31]

Ubaidullah Sindhi believes in “one India” but not in “one Indian Nation”. India in area and in the variety of its population and languages is multi-national like Europe. According to him a nation is a human group which has a certain homogeneous culture and speaks one language which becomes a vehicle of communicating any ideology among the members of such group. From this point of view India is not one nation. However, he is not in favour of dividing India into several linguistic or cultural units. On the other hand, he suggests that a large unit should be constituted by bringing together smaller units which will function as autonomous states. He holds that the Congress under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi has raised the slogan of one country, one nation, one language, and one culture and one philosophy by which they mean Aryavrat, the Hindu nation, Hindi language, Vedic culture and Gandhian philosophy, respectively. He points out that Mahatma Gandhi had ignored two important contributions to Indian culture: firstly, the Muslim culture and thought and, secondly, European culture and values. He complains that Gandhi did not give adequate importance to the technological revolution in his philosophy of life. Thus, he maintains, his disillusion the Muslims and the socialists with his leadership. Sindhi describes Islam as an international movement although it does not reject nationalities. According to him, nation is a natural division of men, living in the same geographical boundaries and environment. The Indian Muslims are a nation like the Arab, Persian or Turkish nations.

However, it should not be ignored every nation is a part of a larger human brotherhoom. Likewise the idea of Islamic nationalities is not opposed to the unity of *Millat-i-Islamiya*.

Sindhi is keen on the unity among the cultural, linguistic and religious units in India. He states that in spite of such diversities such units, living together in a certain territory for a long period, necessarily develop some philosophy which serves as a basis for unity. Sindhi suggests that there does exist such philosophy among the Indian national units. According to Sindhi, it is Monism (*Wahadat al-Wajud)*. Monism, he holds, is the soul of every religion. It is common to both Hinduism and Islam. He believes that Monism as elaborated by Shah Waliullah, can serve as an ideology according to which the future free Indian Government can function smoothly. This ideology, on the one hand, assimilates the best features of Vedic philosophy and, on the other hand, those of Indian Islamic thought which has absorbed the best of Hindu philosophical ideas. Sindhi further maintains that if this Monistic philosophy adapts itself to the demands of the new age and absorbs the good elements of European thought without sacrificing its own character it can achieve the highest perfection of Vedic and Islamic India. On its basis a great edifice of united India can be built up devoid of conflicts of religions, communities and nationalities.[32]

The third session of the Congress, which was held in Madras under the Presidentship of Badruddin Tyabji, was fairly representative not only on the Muslims of the Bombay and Madras Presidencies but also of those of Central and Northern India. The number of Muslim delegates went on increasing in the succeeding years. One of the main factors that created political consciousness among the Muslims and brought them to the National Congress was the harm of Badruddin Tyabji's personality and the impact of his zealous efforts. Badruddin Tyabji (1844-1906) was one of the first Indian Muslims to have his higher education in England and the first Indian barrister-at-law to be enrolled at the Bombay High Court. The main field of Tyabji's political activities, however, was in the wider expanse of national life. In 1885, Tyabji along with Pherozshah Mehta and Telang started the Bombay Presidency Association for promoting the common interest of the Indian nation and was elected its chairman. In 1887 Syed Amir Ali, who was at that time Secretary of the Central National Mohammadan Association of Calcutta, wanted to hold a political conference of the local Muslims and invited Badruddin Tyabji to attend it. He refused to do so, suspecting that the object of the conference was to prevent Muslims from joining the Congress and advised Syed Amir Ali against starting a separate political movement of the Muslims. At the end of the year Tyabji was elected President of the third session of the National Congress held in Madras.

The proceedings of the session are very important for the study of the political trend of Indian Muslims towards the end of the nineteenth century. They provide a definite proof that not only in Bombay and Madras, which were ahead of other provinces in modern education and political consciousness, but also in other parts of India, there were a number of Muslims who were prepared and indeed keen to take part in the common national movement.[33] Here, from the speeches of the President and other Muslim delegates, which will give an idea of the mind of the nationalist Muslim in those days. Tyabji said in his presidential address:

Gentlemen, it is undoubtedly true that each one of our great Indian communities has its own peculiar social, moral, educational and even political difficulties to surmount, but, so far as general political questions affecting the whole of India-such as those alone which are discussed by this Congress-are concerned, I for one an utterly at a loss to understand why Muslims should not work shoulder to shoulder with their fellow-countrymen of other races and creeds for the common benefit of all. Gentlemen, this is the principle on which we in Bombay Presidency have always acted and from the umber, the character, the position and attainment of Mussalman delegates from the Bengal Presidency and from the Presidency of Madras as well as from the North-West Provinces and the Punjab, we have not the smallest

doubt that this is also the view with but few, though perhaps important, exceptions of the leaders of the Mussalman communities throughout India.[34]

Mr. Hamid Ali Khan, Bar-at-law from Lucknow, referring to 'the far-sighted policy of Badruddin Tyabji and the Bombay Mohammadans, of Mir Humayun Jah and the Madras Mussalmans and of some, at any rate, of the ablest Mohammadan gentlemen of Bengal, Oudh, the North-West Provinces and the Punjab', said :

It is their example which has prevented the rest of us from blindly… following the suicidal policy of those two or three able but far-sighted leaders to whose unhappy defection from the national cause Mr. Badruddin Tyabji referred… there is absolutely no need for different platforms for Hindus and Muslims but one common platform where there is ample room for both.[35]

Syed Abdul Aziz, a pleader from Nagpur, said in his Urdu speech:

I think it is necessary that I should say something about the relations between Hindus and Muslims in the Central Provinces and convey to you their unanimous views. For the sake of brevity it would be enough to say that, in our part of the country, Hindu-Muslim relations are brotherly and friendly. In every scheme of public welfare, whether it is initiated by my co-

religionists or by the Hindus, each community sincerely supports the other (Cheers). I can say with authority about my province that, as far as I have been able to find out, not a single Muslim is opposed to this meeting of the Congressmen (Cheers). The allegation by some Muslims who do not want to take part in the Congress, that when Muslims are in need of help from the Hindus the latter refuse to help them, is absolutely absurd and false.[36]

Shaikh Qaidr Baksh, the delegate from Faizabad, also spoke in Urdu. Among other things he said:

I regard it as my duty to tell you the position of those who have done me the honour to send me here as their representative. I come from Faizabad which is, after Lucknow, the most important city in Oudh. The Hindus and Muslims there are in full sympathy with the National Congress and hold each other in brotherly affection. As a proof of this I have been given this letter of authority signed by the representatives of both communities (Cheers). We are unanimously of the opinion that this Congress is not an association of Bengalis or of any particular community or society, as those who are opposed to this organization have falsely asserted. But it is really and truly the National Congress of India. Whether Hindus or Muslims, we are all children of the mother India and are bound to each other by fraternal ties (Loud Cheers).[37]

If we keep in mind these speeches made by responsible leaders from the Congress platform and about a hundred *fatwas* issued by Muslim *ulama* in support of the Congress and then read the following extracts from a letter by ‘an Indian Muslim’ published in the London *Times* on 22 December, 1887, we shall undoubtedly reject the claim made by the writer of the anonymous letter:

The Indian National Congress was got up by a handful of Bengali and Parsi gentlemen… Anglo-Indian papers were already discussing, whether having regard to the entire absence of the Mussalman element, it can be called an Indian National Congress at all… it was an entirely Hindu Congress and the Mohammadans will have nothing to do with it nor sympathise with it.[38]

But the British Government and its Indian supporters thought it expedient to confirm in public what was claimed in the letter, though behind the curtain, the participation of Muslims in the Congress was admitted as a deplorable fact and a disastrous trend and every possible effort was made to check it.

Like the communalist Muslim movement that went on under the intellectual guidance of Iqbal and the practical leadership of Mr. Jinnah, the movement of religious nationalism led by Shaikh-ul-Hind Maulana

Mahmud-ul-Hasan and other *ulama* also passed through many ups and downs.

Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan (1851-1920) was among the first batch of students to be educated at the Deoband seminary, and was regarded as a brilliant student and a favourite pupil of Maulana Muhammad Qasim Nantovi. He completed his education in 1874 and after some time was formally appointed at teacher. In 1905, when Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi passed away, Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan succeeded him as the academic head of the institution. The fame of the Maulana's learning, especially his profound knowledge of *hadith*, spread far and wide and students were drawn to his classes not only from every part of India but also from Afghanistan, Central Asia and Hijaz.

Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan inherited from his two predecessors not only their learning and piety but also their love of liberty. In fact, his passion for freedom was even more intense than theirs. He had made a deep study of the history of India and its present political and economic problems, and the regular reading of news-papers kept him in touch with current affairs.[39]

Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan first sent Ubaidullah to Delhi to propagate his ideas among the modern educated youth and to win them over

for his movement; and then in 1915 asked him to go to Kabul, where many of the old pupils of the Maulana were keenly interested in the Indian freedom movement. Their idea was to try in cooperation with a revolutionary party of Raja Mahendra Pratrap, to liberate India with the help of the governments of Germany, Turkey and Afghanistan. So they set up a provisional national Government under the presidentship of Raja Mahendra Pratap, and began to prepare for a war of independence. They also tried to establish contacts with Russia and Japan and sent their mission to those countries but failed to achieve any results.[40]

Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan's revolutionary zeal was at work in India. He had realized that in order to win freedom for India, the religious-minded Muslims would have to work together with the modern, educated Muslims as well as with non-Muslims. Accordingly he had close contacts with nationalist Muslim leaders like Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, Maulana Muhammad Ali and Dr. Ansari and with Hindu, Muslim and Sikh members of revolutionary groups. His favourite pupil and comrade, Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani, writes in his autobiography:

Hazrat Shaikh-ul-Hind had built a separate house near his own…. It was a guest house for non-Muslim friends of his way of thinking and his revolutionary comrades…. In his moments of leisure, during the day or at night Hazrat Shaikh-ul-Hind would go by himself to meet them and

converse with them. They were mostly Sikh or Bengali Hindu revolutionaries (connected with the agitation for the partition of Bengal).

Naturally the British Government regarded Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan as a very dangerous person, especially during the war, and kept him under strict surveillance.[41] His spiritual guidance inspired the religious class as well as the generation of the Muslims to follow the way of Indian nationalism, which the statesmanship of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and other political leaders had shown them, so that all the storm and stress of the coming days could not make them swerve from it.

Similarly, he helped Maulana Muhammad Ali, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Dr. Ansari and other leaders to guide the religious and secular education of the Muslims which were proceeding on separate lines, to a common middle path and to infuse into it the spirit of freedom. On 29th October 1920, he inaugurated at Aligarh an independent national institution, the Jamia Millia Islamia, for the religious and secular education of the young men who, in response to Mahatma Gandhi's appeal, had left the M.A.O. College and other institutions. Within a month after this he passed away. Maulana Husain Ahmad returned from Malta. The Jamiat-ul-Ulama was founded by distinguished divines including Maulana Abdul Bari of Firangi Mahal, Mufti Kifayatullah, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Maulana Habib-

ur-Rahman of Ludhiana. The object was to guid the Muslims in all religio-political matters.[42]

Azad emerged on the political scene of India as the most consistent Muslim leader subscribing to the theory of Muslims belonging to the Indian Nation. Azad impresses as a rare combination of religious fundamentalism and political liberalism. He does not speak as a modernist while appealing to the Indian Muslims to follow Congress and reject the stand of Muslim League. Neither he is a political leader suggests the Indian Muslims to side with the Congress as policy of expediency. There is no reference to the validity of the Western values of democracy in his passionate appeals for which the Congress stood. He takes the stand of a staunch Muslim and asks his coreligionists to act according to the commands of the Quran.

Abul Kalam Azad’s public career starts with the publication of *Al-Hilal* in 1912. By this time Indian politics has already entered the phase of Hindu-Muslim rivalry. Azad without any party affiliations at that time provided the basis for the formulation of political policies by the Indian Muslims. He suggested that the basis of future policy should be a permanent and consistent belief independent of any external support. There is no need, he declared, of learning lessons in culture and politics from the Hindus. The Muslims should follow the Quran. He asserted that the Muslims had no

separate nationhood bound by any specific racial or geographical considerations. For Muslims Islam and God have the same significance as the words nation and fatherland has for the others.[43]

Having established religion as the basis of their political activity, Azad calls upon the Indian Muslims to participate in the struggle for Indian freedom. It is significant that Azad describes the Muslim participation in the freedom as *Jehad* for freedom. In an article entitled "al-Jehad fi al-Hurriyat" Azad points out that whereas for the Hindus it is partriotism to struggle for India's independence, for the Muslims, it is a religious duty and Jehad in the path of God. He says that the concept of Jehad covers all steps taken for breaking the chains of slavery and suppression and hence all the Indians who are participating in this struggle are Mujahids. Referring to the fear of Hindu majority Azad describes it as a superstition. He holds that power depends not on numbers but on the inherent power of nations which is generated by morals, character, unity and virtuous actions. It was again as early as 1912 that Azad characterized the confrontation between Muslims and Hindus as engineered by the British Government.

In 1921 he called upon the Indian Muslims to unite with the Hindus and become one Indian Nation. He supported his suggestion with the well-known Covenant of Madina between the Prophet and the non-Muslim

tribes in which the Prophet proposed that the Muslims and other tribes should enter into a pact of peace as one nation (*Ummah*) against the Quraish.

That Azad treats the Muslim problems as a part of the larger Indian problem becomes clearer by his understanding of the Khilafat movement. He regarded the unity of the Indian people and Non-cooperation Movement as a matter of faith for the Muslims. He describes the Khilafat movement as the Indian Freedom Movement. Hindu-Muslim unity was more precious to him than India's freedom. A delay in the achievement of *Swaraj* would be a loss for India whereas the loss of Hindu-Muslim unity was a loss of the whole humanity. Describing the common Indian cultural heritage of the past centuries as the treasure of united nationalism, he strongly criticizes the Hindu and Muslim revivalist tendencies. He regards as superfluous all such attempts which aim at the revival of the culture of the days prior to the era of Hindu-Muslim composite life. "I am proud", he declared in 1940, "of my being an Indian and a part of the indivisible and united Indian nationhood". Like Hinduism Islam has also become a religion of the Indian peoples during the last one thousand years.

Azad opposed the partition of India till the last moment. He held that instead of solving the communal problem, partition would make it a permanent feature of the country. He asserted that as a Muslim he was not prepared to give up his right to treat the whole of India as his domain and to

share in the shaping of its political and economic life. Immediately after independence he advised the Indian Muslims against forming political parties on communal basis. He hoped that in independent India the basis of future alignments would be class and not community.

It appears that Azad in the first phase ending in 1920 used religious terminology while addressing the Indian Muslims with regard to their political attitudes and supported his policy statements by Quranic versus and traditions. During the second phase (1920 onwards) he gave up appealing to the Muslims, on the basis of religion. He concentrated more on the theme of united nationhood of Hindus and Muslims on socio-political and historical grounds. However in both the phases he was consistent in treating the Indian Muslims (a religious group) as a part of Indian history, culture and society.[44]

To the religious nationalists, Islam is the only alternative to nationalism. Those accept the principles of Islam are not divided by any distinction of nationality or race, or class or country. A Muslim's loyalty is only to God and to Islam. The loyalty to Islam and nationalism both is a betrayal of ignorance of the teachings of Islam as well as nationalism.

Islam and nationalism are often considered as contradictory terms. Apart from theologians, many other Muslims trained in modern

disciplines also maintain that Islamic internationalism is both political as well as religious. Even a great Muslim thinker like Dr. Iqbal entered into polemics on this question with Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani, a leader of nationalist Jamiat-ul-Ulama and the rector of Darul-ul-ulum Deoband. Strangely enough, Iqbal defended Islamic internationalism and Maulana Madani's composite Indian nationalism. Maulana Madani, a support of his position, quoted profusely from the Quran. Main thrust of the Maulana's argument is that the word *qaum* (community or nation in the modern context) has been used over two hundred times in the Quran but no where it is indicative of separate *qaumiyyat* (nationhood) for believers and unbelievers, for prophets and Kafirs. On the other hand, quoting the verses, the Maulana proves that the Quran asserts that His prophets and Kafirs belong to the same *qaum*; the only difference between them is that of belief.

Nationalism is a territorial or geographical concept, not religious one. Apart from territory its other determinant factors are language, culture and common economy. The Quran too, apart from territory, recognizes the significance of these factors in a very explicity way. The Quran says "For every folk *qaum* is a guide" (13:7). Also, it says, "And we never sent a messenger save with the language of his folk" (14:7). Thus we see that Allah has sent His messengers to different folks or communities in their own languages. The commonalty of territory and language is duly

recognized by the Quran. Even cultural and ritualistic differences have not been overlooked. “Unto each nation” says the Quran, “have we given sacred rites which they are to perform; so let them not dispute with thee of the matter, but summon thou unto thy Lord. Lo! Thou indeed followest right guidance.”(22:67)

The Quran having recognized all the important determinants of *qaumiyyat* (nationhood) i.e. language, culture and territory it would not be in the right spirit of the Quran to maintain that there is no place for nationalism in Islam. Even the practice of the Prophet (Sunna) gave it a due recognition by entering into a pact with different tribes and religious groups of Madina to constitute a political community. This pact has been referred to in the Islamic history as *Sahifah.*

The noted orientalist Nicholson comments : “No one can study it without being impressed by the political genius of its author. Ostensibly, a cautious and tactful reform, it was in reality a revolution. Muhammad does not strike openly at the independence of the tribes, but he destroyed it, in effect, by shifting the cente of power from the time to the community.” It was on the basis of this pact that the Jamiat-ul-Ulama-i-Hind justified its stand on composite nationalism and accepted the Congress ideology. Thus both the theory and (the Prophet’s) practice of Islam do not contradict the modern concept of nationalism.[45]

Nationalsim in independent India was taken for granted. The stable continuity of the government the existence of the congress as a national coalition based on abroad section of the society. A population which was obviously not on the verge of a revolution and the absence of a severe external threat did not call for a special appeal to nationalism. The agitation for linguistic provinces proved to be a transitory disturbance. The emerging leadership of the regional majority groups was accommodated in the political system sacrifices for economic development were either not demanded or obviated by foreign aid, or if they had to be made, they were made by a patient population which did not quite know where normal suffering ended and special sacrifices began.

It is only now that India may enter a new phase of nationalism as it finds itself surrounded by hostile neighbours and has embarked on a large scale defense programme while at the same time maintaining its economic development and solving the problems inherent in Indian federalism. So far India's nationalism has retained its secular quality and it is to be hoped that this secular nationalism will stand the test which has been set for it by adverse circumstances. This depends first of all on the new

generation that has grown up in independent India and does not know much about the controversies and problems of earlier phases of nationalism. This generation will have to define its own nationalism and we do not yet know definition they will choose.[46]

References:

1. G.Aloysius, Nationalism without a Nation in India (1997) P.93, published by Manzar Khan, Oxford University Press, Jai Singh Road, New Delhi.

2. Ibid P.170

3. K.K.Gangadharan (Ed.) Indian National Conciousness – Growth and Development (1972), P.146, Published by D.R. Goyal for Kalamkar Prakashan, New Delhi.

4. R.Suntharalingam, Indian Nationalism, A Historical Analysis (1983), P.43, Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., Ansari Road, New Delhi.

5. Opcit. K.K.Gangadharan PP.145-146.

6. S.R. Ghosh, Muslims in Indian Democracy (1984), P.173, Ashish Publishing House Punjabi Bagh, New Delhi..

7. Krishan Mohan, Indian National Congress and the freedom Movement (1999), P.4, Published by Book ENCLAVE, Jaipur.

8. Birendra Prasad, Indian Nationalism and Asia (1979), PP.5-6, B.R. Publishing Corporation.

9. Opcit. Krishan Mohan, P.1

10. Opcit. S.R. Ghosh, P.173.

11. Padmashala, Indian National Congress and the Muslims, (1980), PP.2-3, Published by Rajesh Publications, Ansari Road, Daryagunj, New Delhi.

12. Jagannath Patnaik, British Rule in India (1976), P.193, S. Chand and Co. Pvt. Ltd., Ramnagar, New Delhi.

13. Opcit. Birendra Prasad, PP.1-2.

14. Opcit. Jagannath Patnaik, P.192.

15. S. Abid Husain, The Destiny of Indian Muslims (1969), P.17, Published by P.S. Jaya Singhe Asia Published House, Bombay.

16. Ibid. P. 18.

17. Ibid. P.20

18. Indian History (Modern) (2003) Revised and updated by Nonica Datta, Published by Aalok Wadhwa, Managing Director, Encyclopedia Britanica India Pvt., Ltd.

19. Opcit. S.Abid Husain, P.21.

20. Ibid. P.21.

21. Nagendra Kumar Singh, Islamic Mysticism in India (1996), P.185-200 published by A.P.H. Publishing Corporation, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi.

22. Opcit. Birendra Prasad. PP.7-8.

23. Iqqtidar Husain Siddiqui, Islam and Muslims in South Asia, (1987), P.156, Adam Publishers and Distributors, Matia Mahel, Delhi-6.

24. Opcit. Berendra Prasad, PP.7-8.

25. Freedom Movement and Urdu Prose (2004), Dr. Zia-Ur-Rehman Siddiqui, Translated by arinder Seth, Vikas Prakash, Kanpur, P.22.

26. Moin Shakir, Muslims and Indian Nationalism, Edited by K.K. Gangadharan, Indian National Conciousness, Growth and Development, (1972), P.150, Kalamkar Publication, New Delhi.

27. Ibid, P.151.

28. Ibid, P.153.

29. Ibid, PP.155-156.

30. Opcit. S.Abid Husain, P.59.

31. Anwar Moazzam, Indian National Consciousness Growth and Development, (1972), PP.190-191, Kalamkar Publication, New Delhi.

32. Ibid. P.173.

33. Opcit. S.Abid Husain, PP.45-46.

34. Official Report of the third Indian National Congress, Madras, 1887, P.72.

35. Ibid. P.78.

36. Report of the Third Indian National Congress (Authorised Urdu Version, Published by Ganga Prasad Verma, Lucknow, 1888) P.164.

37. Ibid, P.205.

38. Husain, B.Tyabji, Tayabji (A Biography of the Nationalist Muslim Leader, Published by Thacker and Co., Bombay, (1952)), PP.196-197.

39. Maulana Sayed Mohammed Miya Saheb, Aseeran-e-Malta, (2002) PP.43-45, Kutubkhana Naeemiya, Deoband.

40. Opcit. Maulana Mohammed Miya Saheb PP.46-47.

41. Opcit. S. Abid Husain. P.76.

42. Opcit. S. Abid Husain, P.78.

43. Opcit. Anwar Moazzam, P.167.

44. Opcit. Anwar Moazzam, PP.168-169.

45. Asgar Ali Engineer, Islam and Muslims, A Critical Reassessment, (1985), PP.6—62, Published by Kiran Gupta, Printwell Publishers, Mangal Marg, Jaipur.

46. Dietmar Rothermand, the Phases of Indian Nationalism (1970), P-25, Published by Nackiketa Publications Limited, 22, Naushir Bharucha Road, Bombay-7.

CHAPTER – 3

MUSLIMS

AND

NATIONAL MOVEMENT

The Indian National Movement was emerged at the instance of colonialism in the last quarter of the 19th century. At that time J.A. Hobson wrote in this work on imperialism at the end of the 19th Century. Lenin Hilferding and Bukharin too wrote this in the second decade of the 20th Century. They analysed what was happening in the colonies. The Indian freedom struggle was rooted in scientific understanding of society, and therefore it was able to form this vision, which came out of the heads of a few people.[1] Movements are not made by leaders. Movements are made by the masses. Masses moves on their own and nobody knows what enables them to move. A leader is not one who creates a movement or moves the masses but who knows when the masses are stirring, who knows when masses are getting into motion. Then he comes forward and provides the right type of leadership and thus a mass movement is launched. Gandhiji

said: I don't see masses getting into motion; therefore it is not possible for me or anybody to create a mass movement against partition.

Therefore, I would say that the common people are the masters of their own fate and thus India may be built. Primarily on the basis of the vision of the masses which is most important part of our freedom struggle.[2]

The masses in India as elsewhere in the developing countries of the world had always been led by an articulate educated middle class which did not hesitate to exploit them for their own ends. This is all the more true in the case of Indian Muslim during the nineteenth century whose percentage of literacy was the lowest in the country. It was rightly pointed out by Reza-ul-Karim in his 'Muslims and the congress' that the lack of education made the Muslim masses more susceptible to fanatical propaganda carried out by certain leaders. It does not mean however, that they were completely unaware of the great political changes that were taking place in the country as is evident from the various rebellions in which they participated to throw out the foreign rulers.[3]

The Role of Muslims in India's freedom struggle is a glorious episode in the history of India. It represents the valour, sacrifice and patriotism of Indians. The movement lasted for about a century. In this struggle Muslims did play an important Role. Fought to liberate India from

the yokes of British imperialism with Hindu brethren, tolerated untold sufferings, made great sacrifices and thus served the country commendably.

Muslims from the earliest stages of Indian freedom movement played a pre-dominant role but their sacrifices have not been recognised. Those who shed their blood for the freedom of this motherland are in the dark corners of history today. The History of Indian National Movement would be incomplete without the presenting the actual role of Indian Muslims in it.

The divide and rule policy adopted by the British to consolidate and perpetuate their power in India, the circumstances that led to the partition of British India and the gruesome communal riots that erupted eventually broke the unity of Indian people, who otherwise fought unitedly against the British.[4]

The establishment of British rule in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa after the battle of Buxar in 1764 set the stage for diabolic loot and plunder of India. It was unprecedented in the history of modern times. It is a common knowledge of history the vast masses of peasantry and the old zamindars were driven to the forest to fight for their very survival. Against this ruthless invader first flag of revolt (1763) was unfurled by Majnushah, the leader of a band of fakirs along with the Bhawani Pathak, the leader of band of

sannyasis. It lasted up to 1800. (Santimoy Ray, Freedom Movement and Indian Muslims, PP.1-3)

These fakirs and sannyasis mainly belonged to religious orders like madaria sect amongst Muslims and saiba sect amongst Hindus. They were not properly organised throughout the land. But they could successfully inspire the oppressed peasantry with an ideal to fight for their independence. Culture and religion throughout Bengal and Bihar under the united leadership of Majnushah and his lieutenants Musa Shah and Cheraghali, and Bhawani Pathak, Debi Choudhurani, Kripanath, Nur-ul- Mohamed, Pitambar.

Majnushah inflicted series of defeats to the British armies led by Mackenzi (1766). In another battle Commander Keith was defeated and killed (1769). In 1799 Sobhanali aided by Neagu Shah, Budhu Shah and Imam Shah organized oppressed peasantry. By 1799 to 1800 they established their base at the dense forest of Bogura. But very soon they were surrounded by British army and the first uprising against the firingis came to an end.[5]

As early as 1799 there was a conspiracy of the Muslims of Benaras (Varanasi) led by Vizir Ali with the active help of Hindu chiefs such as Raja Jheo Lal, Jagat Singh of Sarnath, Sheo Deo of Benaras and others. Lord Wellesley reported to the Court of Directors on 22nd April 1799: “You will observe that persons concerned in this treason are almost exclusively

Mohammedans and several of them of high rank. It is radical imperfections in the constitution of our establishment in India, that no system appears to have been adopted with a view earlier to conciliate the goodwill or to control the disaffection of this description of our subjects, whom we found in possession of the Government, and whom we have excluded from all share of emoluments, honor and authority, without providing any adequate corrective of those passions incident to the loss of dignity, wealth and power." The overzealous activities of the Christian missionaries further worsened the situation. Mangles, Chairman of Board of Directors of East India Company, said in the British Parliament (1857): "Providence has entrusted the extensive empire of Hindustan to England that the banner of Christ should waive triumphant from one end of India to the other. Everyone must exert all his strength that there may be no dilatoriness on any account in continuing in the country the work of making all India Christian."

In 1816 there was an open rebellion at Bareilly ostensibly against the imposition of police tax. It was led by Mufti Muhammad Aiwaz, a respected leader of Rohilkhand. This agitation assumed formidable character when a woman was wounded by the police in course of forcible collection of tax. Muslims of the entire area flocked to Bareilly and made a concerted attack on the police. The army had to be called and about 300 persons were killed, many were wounded and taken prisoners. We may also

refer here to the rebellion of Pagal Panthis of Sherpur (1833) under Tipu Shah Son of Karam Shah. They led a no rent campaign and looted the house of the zamindar. The British forces under Major Monterath were not able to crush the rebels who had taken possession of the country between Sherpur and Garo hills. Thearmy had to be reinforced and the rebellion was crushed after a great loss in men.[7]

Shariatullah in East Bengal (d.1837) started the Farazi mvement with the object of restoration of Muslim rule after driving out the British. The movement gained strength under his son Dadu Miyan (1819-1860) who became a force to be reckoned with. He forced Muhammadan peasants to join his movement. He would levy taxes, administer justice and punish the guilty. He was arrested in July 1857 and confined in Alipore jail as a state prisoner. He breathed his last in 1860.

While Dadu Miyan was leading a movement in Faridpur and adjoining districts, Mir Nasir Ali better known as Titu Mir or Titu Mian of Chandpur, a disciple of Saiyid Ahmad, whom he had met at Mecca (1822) was preaching Wahabi doctrines at Baraset (1827). They marched at Purnea and declared that British Raj was over, routed a contingent of Calcutta. Militia sent under Alexander and Manager of Hooghly Factory was captured. The British authorities sent well-equipped troops and artillery to suppress the rebels who fought bravely. Titu was killed in action and his lieutenant

Ghulam Rasul with 350 followers was taken prisoners. Ghulam Rasul was later sentenced to death and 140 of his comrades were punished to various terms of imprisonment.[8]

Wahabis under Saiyid Ahmad of Rai Bareli made the first attempt to drive out the British and restore the Muslim rule (1786-1831). The movement spread throughout the country particularly in Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, the Punjab and North-West Frontier Provinces. It continued for about half a century (1820-1870) with the active support of villagers and peasants who generously donated money out of their meager savings and volunteered their services for getting rid of the foreign rulers. Undoubtedly, initially the movement was anti-Sikh as the Punjab was under their rule at that time but later on after the occupation of the Punjab by the British, it turned completely against the English who had to lead over 17 campaigns to drive out the Wahabis from Sittana in the Frontier Province which they had made their headquarters. In this connection, it is interesting to recall a verse which Maulana Abul Kalam Azad had come across in the records of the India Office Library, London, which reads as follows :

"Our fight was with the foreigners and not with the longhaired Sikhs"

Some of the important leaders of this movement were Ahmedullah, Inayat Ali, Vilayat Ali, Rafiq Mandal and others. In the Government records, there are also references if some Hindus who also participated in the movement.

Saiyid Ahmad was quite successful in enrolling people for his movement. Even he was able to recruit the brother of the ruler of Hyderabad, Mubraiz-ud-Daulah who was tried by a special court and confined to Golconda Fort where he died in 1854. The Wahabis continued their struggle even after his death in 1831 with the active help of Ahmedullah, Deputy Collector of Patna, Yahya Ali elder brother of Ahmedullah, Muhammad Shafi, Muhammad Jafar, Abdul Ghafar, Ilahi Baksh, Miyan Jan and other leaders. The discovery of seditious correspondence by the British intelligence led to the state trials of Ambala in 1864, Patna in 1865 and of Malda in 1870. Most of the accused were transported for life. Justice Norman, officiating Chief Justice of Calcutta High Court, who refused the appeals against some of the accused was mortally wounded by Muhammadan, Abdullah in the court premises on 20th September 1871. Abdullah was supposed to have connected with the Wahabis and died on the gallows without giving any clue to his motive. Four months later in February 1872 Lord Mayo was fatally stabbed at Port Blair, the capital of Penal Settlement in Andamans, by an Afghan Sher Ali who was under sentence of transportation for life for committing a murder. As in the case of Chief

Justice Norman the motive of the murder remained a mystery but Sher Ali calimed to have been a martyr to the cause of Indian Muslims and the country. The great Indian leader, Bepin Chandra Pal called the Wahabi trials as "the first baptism in freedom's fire". Its influence was also evident in the Indigo revolts in Bengal about which Lord Canning wrote "for a week it cost me more anxiety than I have since the day of Delhi."[9]

National liberation entered into a significant phase on 28th December 1885 when Indian National Congress was born in Bombay. During this phase of constitutional agitation, more validly termed as period of moderate ascendancy (1885-1905), leading Muslims like Badruddin Tayabji and Rahmatullah Saini came forward to serve the Congress and adorned the chair of the Congress president. Many Muslim scholars and divines like Moulana Shibli Nomani did not hesitate to stand solidly behind the Congress. Tayabji, president of the third session of the Congress in 1887, was elected as a delegate to the Congress on behalf of the Anjuman-i-Islam. In his presidential address emphatically argued to show how unreasonable it was for any of the important communities of India to remain aloof from the Indian National Congress which was the nation's ray of hope.

Besides Moulana Shibli Nomani many other notable Muslim divines like Moulana Rashid Ahmed Gangoi, Moulana Sulfulla, Molla Mohammed Shiraji, etc. dedicated themselves to work for the Congress.

During the period of the constitutional movement of the Congress against the partition of Bengal it took the form of widespread national movement. British government sought the help of Nawab Salimullah of Dacca to alienate Muslims from the influence of Hindu political leaders. His instigation and propaganda" an atmosphere of communal riots was created in Comilla (East Bengal). However, despite one or two unhappy incidents, many Muslim leaders of Bengal enthusiastically participated in antipartition movement; among those participated mention should be made of Khwaja Atikulla a partner of the Nawab Estate of Dacca. He declared openly, "I may tell you at once that it is incorrect that Mussalmans of East Bengal are in favour of partition of Bengal. Real fact is that it is openly a few leading Mussalmans who for their own purpose support the measure" Also, on behalf of the Central Mohammedan Association. Nawab Amir Husain issued a statement questioning the justification of the government's plan of Bengal's partition.

Muslim leaders put their signatures by hundreds in an appeal issued for collection of fund under the auspices of antipartition fund.

"When the movement spread among the students after the meeting held on 6th August 1905 a very exciting student movement started in Behrampore under the leadership of Abdul Ahmed Yushuf Jilani."

The document in government archives pertaining to the movement against partition of Bengal-popularly known ‘swadeshi movement’- prove that throughout East Bengal in different districts a good number of mass meetings were held in Mymensingh (110), Dacca (75), Comilla (65), Barisal (80), Chittagong (30), Noakhali (70), Calcutta (200) and Faridpur (50).

In all these meetings a large number of Muslim masses assembled and Muslim leaders delivered speeches. A good number of pleaders, mukhtars, teachers and talukdars were among speakers.[10]

The period 1900 to 1909 also witnessed the birth of various secret revolutionary societies in India. Abhinava Bharat in Maharashtra, Mitramela in Tamilnadu, Atmaunnati Anushilan, Suhrid, Sadhana, Brati, Sadesh Bandhab samities in Bengal made their appearance, while Bharatmata Samiti was formed in Punjab.

Damodar Savarkar in Bombay, Shaymji Krishna Varma and Madame Cama in London and Paris, Aurobindo Ghosh and Nivedita in Bengal, Ajit Singh and Baba Kishan Singh in Punjab were few of the pioneers of revolutionary movement aiming to drive away the foreigners from this land.[11]

In spite of the overall religious overtone that existed in all these samities ;Deoband School, under the leadership of Mahmud-ul-Hasan, refused to be sidetracked and went in full preparation, both ideological and organizational, to liberate India from the British yoke.[12]

The armed rising was not planned as purely a Muslim affair. From Punjab the Sikhs and from Bengal the revolutionary party members were invited to cooperate.[13] A house was taken on rent to accommodate them near Mahmud-ul- Hasan's residence in Deoband. There preparations were carried out in secret. Obeidullah Sindhi worked at Deoband and organised the Jamiat-ul-Ansar. Later he was sent to Delhi where a second attempt was made through North-Western Frontier in which Gadar Party and Muslim revolutionaries of Deoband School were involved. As a part of this joint scheme a provisional Azad Hind government was formed in 1916 in Afganisthan with the support of Germany and Turkey. Raja Mahendra Pratap became the president, Prof. Barkatullah was the prime minister with Obeidullah Sindhi as deputy prime minister.[14]

In the official documents the name of Syed Obeidullah is mentioned on several occasions at the time of the First World War. Obeidullah belonged to the province of Sind. He organised revolutionary parties in Delhi, Punjab and NWF Province and made an appeal to the Afgan government to render assistance in their armed struggle against the British.

For various reasons it was not possible for Afgan government to respond. Obeidullah sent an appeal to the Russian tsar to terminate the alliances with the British government and help Indian patriots in their struggle against the British.

Besides Obeidullah, Mohammed Abdullah, Fateh Mahmud, Mohammad Ali were among those Muslim revolutionaries whose names were referred in the documents in connection with the famous Silk Letters Conspiracy (1916).[15] Maulana Mehmud-ul-Hasan was one of the foremost leaders in the rebellion. He among with Moulavi Ansari and Obeidullah launched an all-out campaign among Muslim soldiers of the Middle East relying on active cooperation of Ghalib Pasha, the Turkish governor. Miah Ansari and Sheikh Abdur Rahman at Hyderabad joined them. All the letters written in secret code on silk to Mehmud-ul-Hasan in Hejaz were intercepted by the British. Ghalib Pasha and other Muslim revolutionaries were put under arrest by the betrayal of the sheriff of Mecca. Consequently the conspiracy failed. A large number of army men and a good number of Muslim students belonging to the Muslim revolutionary parties were arrested and convicted to long-term rigorous imprisonment. Mehmud-ul-Hasan became one of the moving spirits in this scheme to drive the British from this land. He was ably assisted by Husain Ahmed Madani. They incited the Muslim army to revolt.

Ultimately they were betrayed by the sheriff of Hehjaz and kept in Malta fort upto 1918.[16]

More than 200 rebel Muslim soldiers were killed in Basra. Due to this revolt hundreds of Muslim youths of Punjab, North-Western Frontier and Sind were imprisoned.

In spite of social and political limitations in determining the objectives of this revolutionary movement, a number of other Muslim Youngman came forward with their own plan. In this connection the name Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was associated in the British archival record. In his autobiography India Wins Freedom Maulana has just touched the point that he came in contact with the Anushilan Samiti leader Aurobindo Ghosh through Shyam Sundar Chakravarti. After his tour of the Middle East, Afghanisthan, Peshawar and northern India, Azad organised a revolutionary society named Hizbullah in Calcutta. Earlier he started a paper call *Al-Hillal*. This society was organised on the model of Maniktala. Muslim youth, was asked to take an oath in Kiddirpur Kabrasthan by touching Koran to serve and die for the cause of motherland.

The name of the society, as given in police record, was Dar-ul-Irshad (Divinity College). Student seeking admission to the society was to be unmarried and he would be required to renounce the worldly pursuits.

According to intelligence reports, “Azad’s society came into being in the early part of 1913 when Balkan war was in progress and it was then believed to be nothing less than a secret society. Azad is a dangerous character; it is therefore desirable that a careful watch should be kept on the society and its members.

According to intelligence reports amongst important members of Maulana Azad’s party were all Bengali Muslims e.g. Fazlul Haq Shelbarshi (Comilla), Syed Jalaluddin Ahmed (Khulna), Abdur Rezak Khan (Hakimpur, 24-Parganas), Moulana Muniruzaman Islamabad (Chitagong), Kutubuddin Ahmed (Azad’s Secretary) and Badsha Mia (Faridpur). It was further recorded that Jalaluddin Ahmed of Khulna, a prominent member of Azad’s secret party, succeeded in organizing a mixed band of Hindu-Muslim revolutionaries in Bengal.[17]

While in India the Congress carried on their relentless struggle for the freedom of the country, the Indian National Army under the leadership of Netaji Subhas Schandra Bose in cooperation with Japanese was marching towards eastern frontier of India. The Indian National Army was mostly drawn from the Indian soldiers of the British army who had been made prisoners by the Japanese after the conquest of Malaya Peninsula. Subhas was able to win over people belonging to all the communities-Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs-all of whom fought together under Netaji’s

leadership. In the Azad Hind Army he had among his closest comrades Major General Shah Niwaz and Col. Habib-ur-Rahman. In the Provisional Government there were many Muslims such as Lt. Col. Aziz Ahmad, Lt. Col. M.Z. Miani, Lt. Col. Eshan Qadir, Karim, and D.M. Khan besides Lt. Col. Shah Niwaz. There were other Muslim officers such as Col. Rashid Ali, Col. S.M. Isac besides many others. Among 100 Muslim patriots who laid down their lives where fighting for the emancipation of the country we may specially mention the names of Lt. Asrafi Mandal, Abu Husain, Lt. S.M. Ali, Abdul Aziz Akbar Ali Mohammad, Ali Shah, Altaf Husain, Ata Mohammad, Ahmed Khan, A.K. Mirza, Ayub Khan, S. Akhtar Ali, Mohd. Abbas, Mohd. Anwar and Taj Muhammad,and Abid Husain Safrani who gave the famous slogan '*Jai Hind'* to the party.[18] (Sayed Ibrahim, Fikri, *Hindustani Musalmano Ka Jang-e-Azadi Mein Hissa, 1997*).

Maulana Mohammed Abdul Bari entered into politics in 1912. He used to consult leading Muslim ulema on the question of saving the shrines in Arabia from destruction. They were of the opinion that the safety of 'Harmain Sharif' (Mecca and Medina) was more urgent and the world Muslims should lend support to the Arab Governments in looking after these shrines.

Maulana Bari invited the Ali Brothers and Sheikh Mushir Husain Kidwai at Farangi Mahal and after a prolonged discussion formed an

organization *Anjuman-e-Khuddam Kaaba*. The real aim was to strengthen Muslim politics and create hatred against the British Government so that the Muslim could know the British attitude towards their religious places. The British Government got scent of it and began to suspect the activities of the organization. When the Ali Brothers were imprisoned during World War I and Sheikh Mushir Husain left for Europe in 1916, the *Anjuman* was automatically dissolve. Meanwhile, Gandhi had returned from England in 1915. Sheikh Mushir Husain wrote to Maulana Bari from England about the discussion he had with the young Mohandas Karam Chand Gandhi who was sympathetic to the cause of Caliphate. Gandhiji favoured Muslims' sentiments. Maulana Bari met him in Delhi in 1918 and discussed the problems arising out of Balkan War, Caliphate and the arrest of Ali Brothers.

When, World War First began, Maulana Bari on behalf of the *Anjuman*, requested in a telegram to the Turkish Caliph (Sultan of Turkey) to remain neutral in the war. On the other hand, he got the promise from the English Government, on behalf of Muslims, that the Muslim shrines would not be touched, desecrated or destroyed during the war but protected.

But the British Government backed out of the promise when the war ended. This created uneasiness among the Muslims in India. In September 1919, a big meeting of Muslims took place in Lucknow. After discussing the Caliphate problem, an all India committee known as the

Khilafat Committee, was formed with Seth Chhotani of Bombay as President and Mr. Ahmed Siddique Khattri of Bombay as General Secretary. When the Ali-Brothers were released in December 1919, Maulana Shaukat Ali was made secretary of the Central Khilafat Committee.

Then, Maulana Bari intensified his efforts in order to acquaint Muslims of the true problem and began to muster wide support. Dr. Mukhtar Ahmed Ansari, who was president of the reception committee of the All India Muslim League Conference in Delhi in 1918, asked the Maulana to seek the solution to the problem from the League platform instead of forming a separate organization of Muslims. Maulana Bari agreed to this and the first big conference under his leadership was convened under the banner of the Muslim League in which leading ulema participated.[19]

In 1919, on the occasion of the first Khilafat conference in Delhi, presided over by Mr. A.K. Fazlul Haq of Bengal. Maulana Bari suggested the formation of Jamiat-ul-Ulema Hind. The organization was formed and Maulana Bari presided over the first meeting attended by among others, Hakim Ajmal Khan.[20]

In the year 1919 the cup of misery was full to the brim. "The important factors of unrest were the martial law in the Punjab and its punitive consequences, the defeat of Turkey and its apprehended dismemberment, the

Montagui-Chelmsford reforms and their unsatisfactory character, the economic ills following in the wake of a terrible war, the tremendous revolution in Russia with its explosive ideology."

The transformation of the Congress was precipitated by the Khilafat Movement. A national call for resistance was given on 6th April 1919, it was a unique success, but police firing on Delhi crowd caused a number of casualties among both Hindus and Muslims. It was followed by the infamous massacre of Jallianwala Bagh on 13th April 1919. The Muslims were already deeply affected by the Khilafat issue. The government of Punjab out of panic ordered the arrest of Dr. Satya Pal and Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew. As a protest defiant populace-Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs assembled at Jallianwala Bagh. General O'Dwyer wanted to strike terror into the whole of Punjab and ordered the troops to open fire without warning on the unarmed crowd. More than 1,000 killed and several thousands wounded. Curfew was imposed for weeks. People, both Hindus and Muslims, were flogged in Public Square and made to crawl. Hostages were taken; property was confiscated and destroyed. Hindus and Muslims were handcuffed in pairs to demonstrate the consequence of unity. Martial law was proclaimed.

The Punjab tragedy brought Gandhiji into the forefront of Indian politics. All the time he was being drawn into the khilafat movement from which platform he was soon to declare non-cooperation against the

alien government. A khilafat committee was formed under the leadership of Maulana Azad, Hakim Ajmal Khan and Hasarat Mohani. To Gandhiji, "it was an opportunity of uniting Hindus and Muslims as would not arise in a hundred years." He wrote in young India: "It is my duty to help him (Muslim) in his hour of peril to the best of my ability.

At Amritsar in December 1919 Gandhiji and other Congress leaders discussed with khilafat leaders the plan of work for the removal of Muslim grievances. In the khilafat conference held at Calcutta on 20th February 1920 under the President ship of Abul Kalam Azad a resolution was passed on the non-cooperation movement and it was decided to send a deputation to London to present the khilafat case before the British government. On 16th March Gandhiji issued a manifesto in which he advocated the launching of a non-violent movement. On 19th March a mourning day was observed.[21]

In his autobiography, India Wins Freedom Maulana Azad has given an account of the origin of the non-cooperation little differently. He says:

> "A meeting of the Khilafat was held on 20th January, 1920 at Delhi in which non-cooperation programmed was discussed and decided… Mr. Mohammad Ali and Shaukat Ali, Hakim

> Ajmal Khan and Maulvi Abdul Bari of Firangi Mahal, Lucknow, were also present. Gandhiji presented his programme of non-cooperation… As soon as Gandhiji described his proposal I remembered that this was the programme which Tolstoy had outlined many years ago… Others reacted according to their backgrounds. Hakim Ajmal Khan said that he wanted some time to consider the proposal. He would not like to advise others till he was willing to accept the programme himself. Maulana Abdul Bari said that Gandhiji's suggestions raised fundamental issues and he could not give a reply till he had meditated and sought divine guidance. Mohammad Ali Shaukat Ali said they would wait till Maulana Abdul Bari's decision was known. Gandhiji then turned to me. I said without a moment's hesitation. 'I fully accept the programme."[22]

Maulana Bari and the Jamiat fully supported the stand taken under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi to protest against the atrocities in Punjab. Maulana Bari was second to none in preaching the creed of non-violence of Gandhiji among Muslims. Besides, Maulana Hasrat Mohani, disciple of Maulana Bari's father, Maulana Abdul Wahab, also fully subscribed to the movement although he did not accept the non-violence creed of Gandhi. When the All India National Congress with the cooperation

and support of Muslims accepted the creed of Gandhi, the latter became the leader of both the movements-the Congress and the Caliphate. Maulana Bari remained with Gandhi and developed good relations with almost all the leaders-Muslims as well as Hindus.

A group of Maulana Bari's disciple in Farangi Mahal also participated in the Non-Cooperation movement. One of his relations Maulana Mohammad Salamat Ullah Farangi Mahli was sent to jail in 1922. In jail, he was with Motilal Nehru, Jawaharlal Nehru, Mohan Lal Saxena and Chaudhri Khaliquz-zaman. Maulana Mohammad Shafi Hujjat Ullah, son of Maulana Salamat Ullah, who was a leader in the Madrasa of Maulana Azad in Calcutta's Nakhuda Ki Masjid, was also arrested. This Madrasa was established during the Non-Cooperation Movement in order to counter the Government-backed Madrasa Alia. For quite some time Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani was also a teacher at this Madrasa. The best tribute paid to him was that by Mahatma Gandhi himself, who in 1942, when the Quit India Movement was at its peak, retorted to Mr. Jinnah's allegations of Gandhiji's being Muslims' enemy No.1. Gandhiji was addressing the AICC session when he said: "Whether I am an enemy of Muslim or their friend, Maulana Abdul Bari would have answered had he been alive. He was a great man. I used to stay with him in Lucknow."[23]

Mohsin-ul-Mulk Hakim Mohammed Ajmal Khan was a man of multi-dimensional personality. His whole life was a saga of selfless service and sacrifice. Initiating his career as a Unani Physician, he ultimately threw himself into the maelstrom of national politics under the inspiring leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. Starting his early political career as one of the founders of the All India Muslim League, he attempted to mould it as a nationalist organization. In the second decade of 20th century he came to associate himself with the Indian National Congress and his enthusiastic zeal for the national cause made a profound impression upon Mahatma Gandhi with whom he forged a life-long friendship.[24]

A few weeks later at a Khilafat Conference in Meerut, Maulana Azad and Mahatma Gandhi announced the programme of action to the delegates and through them to the nation. Now onwards, Khilafat Conferences became a regular feature of India's political life. These were held all over the country to mobilise public opinion and thus impart strength to the movement. To make it more acceptable to Muslims, Maulana Azad, as president of the Provincial Khilafat Conference at Calcutta on 20th February 1920, gave it a religious interpretation and told the Muslims to remember that such a movement had the sanction of the Shariat. To give it a practical and concrete shape the Central Khilafat Committee decided to fix a day for the observance of the Khilafat Day throughout the country. Consequently 19th

March 1920 was observed as the Khilafat Day everywhere with great solemnity. On this day Hakim Ajmal Khan enjoyed the unique distinction of initiating and inaugurating the Khilafat non-cooperation programme by returning to the Viceroy the Kaiser-i-Hind Gold Medal, two coronation silver medals and the title Haziq-ul-Mulk which were awarded to him earlier in recognition of his meritorious public services as a physician.[25]

On 15th May, 1920 the terms of the Turkish Peace Treaty negotiated at Sevres were made known to the public. Their harshness made the Central Khilafat Committee announce the decision to resort to non-violent non-cooperation at Bombay on 28th May. In order to allay the fears of the Hindus a statement was also issued which assured that "the Muslims of India will fight to the last man in resisting any Mussalman power that may have designs upon India." On 9th June 1920 the Khilafat Committee enunciated the following four stages of non-cooperation:

- Surrender of titles and honorary positions.
- Resignation of posts in the civil services of the Government;
- Resignation from the police and army;
- Refusal to pay taxes.

All through these days Ajmal Khan remained busy in mobilising public opinion in favour of the movement which ultimately started on 1 August, 1920. Unfortunately Lokmanya Tilak expired on this day, of course, after giving his blessings to the movement. According to this treaty Turkey was asked to pay a huge war indemnity also. The Indian Muslims felt humiliated and thought that the only alternative left for them was to intensify the non-cooperation movement. A special session of the Congress was, therefore, convened at Calcutta on 4th September 1920 under Lala Lajpat Rai to chalk out the details of the movement. Keeping the developments in view Gandhiji declared in achievement of Swaraj as the final goal. Thus nationalism and Khilafatism in the words of W.C. Smith were "now organically related, as the avowed twin objects of the entire country". Gandhiji moved his historic resolution on the adoption of "progressive non-violent non-cooperation" and proposed the detailed programme.[26]

Hakim Ajmal Khan stayed in Calcutta throughout the session exchanging views with the national leaders and mobilizing support for the non-cooperation programme from all quarters. As the sessions of the League, Jamiat-ul-Ulama and the Khilafat Committee were also taking place in Calcutta simultaneously, Hakim Saheb served as a link between them. He

was most satisfied with the deliberations of the Calcutta Congress session which had given green signal to Gandhiji to go ahead with his programme.

Following the adoption of non-cooperation programme the Muslim leaders made it a part of daily political activities to preach among the Muslim masses disaffection against the British government.[27]

On 14 May 1936 Asaf Ali suggested to Gandhi that an appropriate memorial be raised in memory of Mukhtar Ahmed Ansari who dedicated his life to the cause of the Indian Nationalist Movement. His idea was to associate Ansari's name with rural medical aid all over India in the form of Ansari Medical Corps' or 'Ansari Traveling Dispensary'. But neither then nor later did such suggestions receive consideration. The Ansari road in Delhi is the only reminder of Ansari's long-standing association with the city as a physician surgeon, political activist and educationist.

Historians in the subcontinent have also ignored Ansari's active political life which spanned over two decades of tumultuous phase in India's struggle for liberation from colonial domination. Leaders bearing no specific affinity to a region or a religious group have not received much notice. Ansari is among cut off from his home state Uttar Pradesh, Ansari chose to live in Delhi in a composite cultural environment and followed a Political course which did not reflect the interest and aspirations of any particular

region or community. In consequence, his role is not only obscure but, he also appears much less charismatic and influential than many of his contemporaries.

Another reason for ignoring the Muslims must be located in the popular perception their failure to counter the two-nation theory, their inability to present a viable alternative to the Muslim league and to rally their community around the congress banner.[28]

Ansari, already known for his good work as leader of the Indian medical mission to Constantinople, was a key figure in Delhi's Home Rule movement. As its President he organized an intermittent but comprehensive scheme of propaganda, declared that liberty of thought and speech was the birthright of every citizen and urged the people to condemn the arrest of Annie Besant. "It is a matter which concerns not simply an individual community or province, but is an all-India question and touches the liberty and the rights of every Indian. Hence silence at a time like this is cowardly and disloyal to one's own people and to one's self." Ansari who already had the nucleus of a small political following, persuaded a number of his younger Muslim friends from UP to attend meetings of the League, hosted their visits to Delhi and initiated them into the Home Rule crusade. Among those he influenced most was Khaliquzzaman (1889-1973), an Aligarh graduate and Tassaduq Ahmad Khan Sherwani (1889-1935), a contemporary of Jawaharlal

at Cambridge who emerged as Ansari's principal lieutenant in subsequent political struggles. The identification of such men threatened to disturb the placid life of Delhi and involve its citizens in an agitation of serious proportions.

In its historical sequence, the Home Rule agitation raised the general level of political consciousness, served as an instrument of mass mobilization and brought to the fore the organizing and leadership qualities of several fresh recruits to the nationalist movement. Among them were Mohammad Ali Jinnah (1876-1948), Jamnadas Dwarkadas, Shankarlal Banker and Umar Subhani (d. 1926) in Bombay, Jawaharlal, Harkaran Nath Misra (d.1890), Khaliquzzaman, Khwaja and Sherwani in UP; Ansari, Ajmal Khan and Asaf Ali in Delhi. Most of them were to occupy a prominent position in the shaping of the country's destiny, but gained their first experience of agitational politics during the Home Rule campaign. Jawaharlal recalled how the atmosphere became explosive those days with the younger men expecting 'big things to happen in the near future and how Annie Besant's internment added to the excitement of the intelligentsia and vitalized the Home Rule movement all over the country.

Ideologically, the Home Rule Leagues operated on supra-communal network and pursued a non-communal programme, a fact which encouraged many Muslims to swell the ranks of Annie Besant's adherents.

For instance, Abdul Majid Khwaja, a successful lawyer and a contemporary of Jawaharlal Nehru at Cambridge, set up a Home Rule League branch in Aligarh with the backing of Haji Musa Khan, and one of the stalwarts at the Aligarh College. Some young lawyers and journalists, close to Motilal Nehru, did the same in Allahabad. In Lucknow its main adherents were several prominent lawyers and journalists.[29]

The countrywide agitation against the Rowlett Bills, enacted by the government and foisted on the country with scant regard for public opinion, offered Ansari an opportunity to plunge into national politics. The Rowlatt Bills rushed through the Imperial Legislative Council in the teeth of opposition from all Indian members, evoked widespread indignation in India. The country's rage and revulsion was articulated by Gandhi, the hero of Champaran, Kaira and Ahmedabad. From his sick bed, he condemned the 'devilish legislation' which was not just 'a stray example of lapse of righteousness and justice' but 'evidence of a determined policy of repression'. When his repeated appeals to the Viceroy to withhold his assent from the 'black bills' failed, he decided on Satyagraha, a weapon, he had effectively put to use to South Africa. "I think the growing generation will not satisfied with petitions etc.," he wrote toDinshaw E. Wacha (1844-1936) on 25 February 1919.[30]

The Ulama of Deoband, with resoluteness and trust in Allah, have always been not only in the foremost rank of those who have struggled in the movement for the independence of India but they have also frequently been in the lead of this movement for independence; and if it is seen more thoughtfully and justly, they were the first persons, the pioneers, who initiated this idea. The warmth, vigor and catholicity which was created in this movement in fact is indebted to them. Most of these gentlemen raised the banner of revolt against the English government, fought face to face with the English army and many of them passed a good part of their lives in jail. The fact is that the history of the independence movement of India is so mixed up with the history of the Ulama and religious personalities that it is now difficult to separate one from the other. Political decline had reduced Muslims to a state of helplessness and misery, distraction and anxiety; by the establishment of Dar-ul-Uloom, Deoband, they received equanimity, composure and stability.[31]

In the prison of Malta, Sheikh-ul-Hind Maulana Mehmood-ul-Hasan (The Teacher at Deoband) and his companions must have got wind of Gandhi's conversion on account of 'Panjab wrong' and 'The Khilafat betrayel' and Gandhi's suggested concept of non-cooperation. The prisoners in the Malta camp were mostly political people and were getting news of not only the war situation but also of the happenings in the world, especially in

the colonies as they were the main strength of the powers hostile to the German-Turkish Alliance. Hints, if not details, must have been there in the letters they received. The radicalization of Indian politics and communal unity must have given them the clue that what they wished to accomplish as part of their political mission was already manifested. Despite all the adversities and troubles that had been encountered abroad Sheikh-ul-Hind had returned home with his sentiments for national independence and hatred of the British unabated. Indeed the information about the oppression in India and the injustice against Turkey perpetrated through the Treaty of Sevres had further hardened his resolve. After discussing the situation with the leaders gathered in Bombay he approved non-violence as the best strategy for attaining independence.[32] Political discourse at that time was focused on the issue of non-cooperation and had not yet got final approval of the Khilafat Committee or the Indian National Congress though both were favourably inclined towards it. In that situation Sheikh-ul-Hind Mahmod-ul- Hasan's support to Gandhi tilted the balance in favour of Gandhi's movement and provided strength to the idea of communal unity. Khilafat Committee members put to him a fatwa in support of non-cooperation.[33] The fatwa read as follows :

> "On return from Malta I have learnt that the leaders of India have adopted a final path to carry out their obligations and to

> defend their sentiments and rights, that is, that they should stick to the tenets of the Holy Quran and follow the great and good tradition of the Prophet and, accordingly, assess the pros and cons for the nation and thereupon fearlessly carry out the program; that path is none other than cooperation with the forces inimical to Islam. The issue before us is not contrary to the Shari'a. The honorable course for a true Muslim can only be that (i) he should return the honors and decorations conferred by the government, (ii) refuse to join the councils currently proposed, (iii) use only indigenous products, and (iv) Not put his children in government schools and colleges. Besides, all the resolutions passed from time to time should be strictly followed. Care should however be taken that (a) in carrying out these resolutions nothing contrary to the Shari'a should be done, (b) whatever threatens violence or is likely to disturb peace should be avoided and in every respect moderation be preferred to extremist action.[34]

Not only did he extend support to the non-cooperation movement but actively participated in it. He inaugurated Jamia Millia Islamia, a national Muslim University founded for teachers and students who revolted against accepting government aid by the Aligarh Muslim University.

He also presided over the second session of Jamiat-ul- Ulama-e- Hind where he welcomed the united struggle of Hindus and Muslims and pleaded for continuation of the unity which, he felt, was the only way to freedom of the country. He recommended to the entire Muslim community cooperation with other communities with the only condition that there is no interference in the religious affairs of Muslims.

Just a week after that session of the Jamiat Sheikh-ul-Hind died. But before that he clarified his viewpoint with formal fatwa in response to questions from the students of Aligarh Muslim University whether accepting help from the government was legitimate or not. In response he quoted several passages from the Qur'an to prove that non-cooperation meant not only extending help to the enemy but also accepting enemy's help.

That fatwa was signed on 29th October, 1920. The date is significant as, according to Maulana Mohammad Miya, it refutes the misinformation spread by interested parties that he had supported Non-cooperation movement because of Gandhi's support to the cause of Khilafat. By the above date the issue of Khilafat had lost relevance because the Turks themselves had put an end to it. It is, on the other hand, proof of his commitment to the cause of India's freedom. Indeed that was the position of almost all those who had joined Gandhi's movement in response to the call of

Khilafat Committee. Thus their motivation was not only defense of an Islamic institution but complete freedom of India.[35]

Maulana Husain Ahmad had come away from Madina and joined Sheikh-ul-Hind purely with the intention of providing company and comfort to his teacher. He had no intention to get involved in the Indian struggle though he was totally in agreement with its goal as also with the strategies adopted by the Sheikh. He had thought that in India there would be enough other people to look after the Sheikh so he would go back to Madina and resume teaching. He put the proposal to the Sheikh while they were on their way to Bombay. The letter replied that he wanted to write elucidatory notes on the translation of Bukhari Shareef (one of the collections of the sayings and traditions of the Prophet) and for that 'I need your help'. Maulana had earlier assisted him in this work and understood the proposal but put a condition for his stay at Deoband, that the Sheikh would not use the time reserved for that task for anything else however important. The Sheikh said he also had a condition. In answer to question about it his reply was: "I will tell you later."

On seeing the Sheikh's activities in Bombay he felt that the translation work was impossible. So, he sought permission to go to Madina to his brothers Syed Ahmad and Mahmood Ahmad. The Sheikh told him it was not proper for him to go back and he should rather call his brothers to India.

He did not allow him to stay for a few days in Bombay either and insisted to accompany him to Deoband. Thereafter there was no mention of return to Madina by the Maulana, nor did the Sheikh tell him about the condition he had earlier promised. When he engaged in the national struggle the Maulana probably understood that the best service of Islam was to join the struggle for India's freedom. According to Mohammad Miyan the idea had taken root when instead of going to Jedda Maulana Husain Ahmad accompanied the Sheikh to Bombay. It must have matured on seeing the enthusiasm of the community for the national cause and participation in it of the Sheikh; the Sheikh, as pointed out earlier, was hailed as Sheikh-ul-Hind (the leader of India) meaning thereby that the Muslim community saw no contradiction between cause of Islam and that of India.[36] According to Maulana the community must understand that the policy of non-cooperation regarding which a fatwa has been proclaimed is not related to any political exigency. It has been adopted in the context of the character and nature of the ruling establishment and as long as it does not undergo a change the policy as spelt out in the fatwa will remain unchanged, even if Congress abandons that programme and policy.

No wonder Sheikh-ul-Hind lost any time in issuing a fatwa supporting the non-cooperation movement. His chief disciple, to be later acknowledged as his successor, Maulana Hussein Ahmad, followed him up

with a pamphlet Tark-e-Mawalaat justifying the strategy. Special feature of that tract, according to Syed Mohammed Miyan is that it is not based on mere historical references or abstract arguments but on concrete facts observed and personally experienced by the author. He was not motivated only by his dedication to Islam and had a fairly comprehensive idea of how India was exploited and why freedom was essential to end the miseries heaped upon Indians as also to safeguard the honour of Islam, is clear from the speeches he made in various Khilafat conferences that he addressed. Those speeches mirror, besides his dedication to Islam, a strong patriotic fervor and pride in India's past glories. Here are some excerpts from his speech at the conference held at Seohara (District Bijnaur) on February 21, 1921. After explaining the need and importance of the Khilafat movement he dilates upon the injustices to which India had been subjected:

> India is the country that enriched the entire world with its industry and trade. Others depended on her not India on others. Since the beginning of life till hundred years ago it was the golden period of its history. It was not merely source of humanity but of all culture. There was no rival to its cultural attainments either in West or East. India was cultured when the entire world was sub-human. While the world was swayed by ignorance India was rich in learning. When the world starved India was satisfied. Is Arithmetic and science of numbers on

> which stands the edifice of culture not a gift of this country? Are *vaidik* (medical science) and astronomy not the pride of India?

From material superiority he goes on to describe India's eminence in the spiritual field saying:

> Was it not the leader of countries around in spiritual sciences? When the light of Islam shone upon this country it did not minimize its ancient attainments, only those attainments of Arabia, Persia and Turkey were added which had not yet reached it. India was by nature a land endowed with rich understanding, deep thought, conscientious mind and patient physique. Moderation is its distinction and being the centre of humanity its superiority. That is why for years on end Europe directed its endeavours in its direction. Was there a king or emperor who did not cherish the desire to take it over? Which nation of the world had not suffered in cherishing its beauties? Is there anything in the world which is not available here and which is the quality of which Indian communities are bereft? What after all is the reason why the kings of India assumed the title *shah-e-jahan* (monarch of the world) and the historians describe it as quarter of the world? Just as nature has gifted it with the highest mountain peak it has also been gifted with deep rivers and geography of spiritual and

> moral environment that no country or region can rival it. The historians have remained busy counting its numerous blessings.

Then follows the exposure of the British claim to a civilizing mission Maulana says:

> It (India) is the only country that can claim spotless record in respect of beastly behavior. It's history is shining with the bright light of culture and civilization. The tragedy however is that in this last century Europe's civilization and Western concept of justice has cast it into such a deep pit of darkness that there is no sign of rescue. The self-styled messiahs of Britain administered medicines ostensibly to revive its life but in fact so debilitated it that it could not even sneeze. The uncivilized brutes of yesterday are today's rulers but India has failed to develop the ability for self-rule.
>
> Eminent British physicians have been earnestly trying to restore it to health but it does not show any sign of recovery. The countries which had not even had a whiff of freedom or self-rule are today leading the world. The nations whom history has depicted and uncultured brutes are considered worthy of self-determination and freedom. Any doubt about their desert is an unpardonable sin in the eyes of Europe. On the other hand keeping a country like India that

> has proved to be the teacher of humanity for independence and ordered life, in chains is deemed to be a sign of superior culture. For it to talk of independence and political rights is a great sin and worst kind of mutiny. If somebody even dreams of its independence his desert would be sentence to death or life imprisonment.

After this introduction to the change in fortunes he comes to concrete facts showing the calamities it is suffering:

> This country (i.e. India) clothed not just its own inhabitants but provided adornment for people in hundreds of other countries. Its textile trade dominated Asia, Africa and Europe. The European strategies and so-called reform measures have rendered it so dependent that just for cotton textiles it has to pay to England sixty crore rupees every year. Once self-sufficient and exporter of food is today brought to a stage where famines are frequent and starvation the lot of its children. Thousands of Indians are going about in other countries in search of livelihood. West is rolling in comfort while children of India cannot afford a cot to sleep. They have rich dresses we go about undressed, the countries that gave their blood for India are today exploiting Indian blood for their own benefit. Strategies are afoot to strengthen the chains of slavery around a once free and prosperous India. Gibraltar, Malta and Eden are enslaved and sea lanes

> are controlled: Egypt, Iraq and Palestine are hunted; Iran is slaughtered and Turkish caliphate is disintegrated and the power of Sudan and Arabia is shattered. All this is done in the name of human welfare, freedom of old countries and reform of humanity!

Not only natural resources of India were exploited and its economy shattered the blood of its youth was shed to expand the empire for which the reward was more oppression and more humiliation. Maulana raises the question: what does India get in return for these sacrifices and replies:

> Only the widowhood of your (India's) daughters, ruination of children, Rowlett Bill, Court Martial, Machine gun rains in Jallianwala Bagh, end of the remnants of freedom, imposition of new taxes, turning a deaf ear to your tales of woe and rewarding the tyrannical oppressors instead of bringing them to book.

The cause of all these misfortunes, he reasons, is disunity and suggests if 350.5 million Indians unite no power on earth can oppress and suppress us. And, suggests the way to such unity:

> For this unity we need not merge our religious identities; no man of faith would tolerate it. We have to be prepared for making sacrifices in the interest of matters concerning the country's politics. There are numerous examples in the world of this happening. Look at Europe. In

> London, France, Russia and Greece, Christians and Jews coexist despite their age-old religious conflict which has been much more intense than the differences between Hindus and Muslims. Not a fraction of the tyranny they have inflicted on each other can be seen in the relations between these two communities and yet they are one in political affairs. Take the Christians. Despite divisions into Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox sects which have been at each other's throat in the past, they act in unison for advancing their national interests. Even as are leaders like Mr. Gandhi, Maulana Shaukat Ali and others who addressed the annual session of Jamiat-ul- Ulama at Delhi and asserted that we do not want to include or exclude even a single religious issue and that each community is free to follow its religion. Hindus as Hindus and Muslims as Muslims should come together and make efforts for the liberation of the country. All peop0le should follow this advice of the leaders. It should at the same time be borne in mind that the enemy and its lackeys would try to break this unity by raising religion related problems and disrupt this unity. They should not be listened and we should proceed with utmost care and perseverance.

The disunity of Indians, he further explains, has not led to problems for Indians alone but is responsible for the freedom of other nations being

usurped. As a result Indians are looked down upon in most countries of Asia and Africa.

Having gone over the details of sufferings and afflictions and having analysed the causes behind all these, he prescribes the remedy: swaraj, without attaining which we cannot count ourselves among the living or can we be instrumental in defense of Asian and African forces.[37]

In July 1921, the Maulana participated in the All India conference of the Khilafat Committee held at Karachi where he moved the main resolution which declared that joining the British Indian army or persuading others to join it and any kind of cooperation with the British government is prohibited for Muslims. Also that propagation of the cause of non-cooperation was the religious duty of every Muslim. The resolution was supported by Maulana Mohammad Ali, Maulana Shaukat Ali, Dr. Saifudding Kitchlew, Peer Ghulam Mujaddid Sindhi, Shankaracharya Swami Krishna Tirth and Maulana Nisar Ali of Kanpur.

It was an open challenge to the authority of the government so that, after due procedure, arrest warrants were issued against all of them. The arrest warrant for arrest of Maulana Hussein Ahmad reached Deoband on September 18. The response of the people to this action of the government

shows how popular the Maulana had already become. The scene has been described by Maulana Rashid Hasan Usmani as follows :

> The rumour about the arrest of Hazrat (Maulana) was rife since morning. People were greatly agitated and were saying that they would not allow Maulana to be arrested. Local officials were assuring that they had not received any such instructions. All of a sudden, in the afternoon a British police officer came with an armed contingent and arrived at the residence of Sheikh-ul-Hind where the Maulana was staying, local tehsildar and station house officer were with him. As the information reached the town all life came to a standstill; everybody, Hindus and Muslims all ran to the Sheikh's residence. So angry was the mob that they could have killed the British officers. The British Deputy Collector, British police inspector and an intelligence officer Abdul Aziz came to the Maulana, showed the warrant and said, "You are under arrest". At this somebody from the mob shouted, "Are you authorized to show the warrant alone or to effect arrest also?" Before the officer could say anything some people attacked him and gave him a few slaps. There was tremendous excitement and the mob was swelling every minute. With great difficulty Maulana and some other elders saved the officers by making a circle around them and put them in a room under lock and key. As the demand of people for handing

the officers over to them grew the Maulana started addressing them and the address continued till the evening. He advised the people not to take law into their hands and take a wrong step. But the excited public would not listen. Ultimately he took off his turban and asked them to let him be peacefully taken into custody for it was a matter of his honour. At this people began to cry and perforce agreed on the understanding that the officers will not take them to station under arrest but the people will reach him there at the head of a procession. People thus pacified the officers were safely taken to the police station at about eleven o'clock at night. (Chirag-e-Mohammed, 2003)

Maulana Mohammad Ali who had presided over the conference was the first to make a statement in the court. He confessed that he had presided over the conference and conducted all the proceedings leading to the passing of the impugned resolution. About the mover of the resolution he said that he was for him the leader.

Till then I had no knowledge about the pamphlets that had been distributed in the army but I was happy to learn that the organization of scholars had taken the initiative to carry the dictates of God to the army.

About the alleged denial of the Jamiat that it had no hand in the distribution of pamphlets he said he did not believe the canard and very soon the issue will get clarified.

The same day after the statement of Maulana Mohammad Ali, Maulana Hussein Ahmad was asked to make his statement. When he started speaking the magistrate found his Urdu beyond his comprehension and asked if some of his companions could help by translating it into simple language. As none was prepared to help the court the hearing was deferred till the next day when the court would arrange its own special translator. The magistrate referred the case to Session's court which started the hearing on October 24 before Mr. Kennedy, the Judicial Commissioner of Sindh. Venue was the same, Khaliq-e-Deen Hall in Karachi.[38]

While the court proceedings were on Maulana's numerous followers and admirers were greatly perturbed and wrote letters making anxious enquiries about his condition as also the prospects of the punishment. A letter he wrote in response reflects very significant dimensions of Maulana's character like unflinching faith in God and message of Islam, humility approaching utter self-abnegation, his approach to politics as also his understanding of the non-violent non-cooperation.

He asks people not to worry about his welfare but about the *deen* (true faith) brought by Mohammad because the enemies of Islam have brought to rack and ruin thousands of families.

Explaining the reason behind this state of affairs and suggesting the remedial measures he writes:

> We are weak, disunited and unarmed whereas our enemy is strong and possesses tremendous resources. But we have to set the adversary right and wreak revenge. And, the resistance has to be based on wisdom and strength, for that is the path prescribed by the Prophet. That is why we can't rest till Khilafat is freed, the Arabian Peninsula is free, India is free and Punjab wrongs have been compensated. If you ask what can be done, my reply would be that it is your sacred duty to bite and cause even a much pain as the bite of an ant.

It is followed by a word of caution indicating his understanding of non-violent non-cooperation:

> I do not at all mean that you should do anything unlawful and indulge in bloodshed. Harm the adversary as much as possible through peaceful means. Persuade others to cooperate in your struggle, weaken the enemy, and hit their trade and industry. Free people from their fear and create courage in them, don't hesitate to speak the truth. Persuade

> people gently and never use harsh methods. Bring together the alienated and don't create a breach in unity and busy yourself in this task.

Next is an instruction which shows that non-violence for him was not a creed but a tactics to defeat the enemy in special circumstances:

> Spread military spirit among people and direct them to learn the martial arts like bank, patta, lakdi, sword play and horse riding, the arts that were the pride of our ancestors. If this becomes a daily hour-half one hour practice, it will bring benediction as also prove useful as means of self-defence.

Thereafter he asserts the gains of the peaceful struggle:

> See the gains from this non-violent war. The arrest of seven of us has infused tremendous strength to our struggle. Fear of government has been reduced. The message that we could not carry to people in months has reached them in no time. The fund for Angora mujahideen has been over-contributed, several people have given up the prohibited service and several other gains that would not have been possible if the movement were violent.

This is followed by expression of confidence:

> God willing we shall defeat the government by this non-violent non-cooperation. Let the people get ready for this novel method. Create in people confidence and unity. Don't however be so strict that they may be frightened away. Make them follow *Shariat*. Daily public meetings would be excessive, two or three meetings per week are enough. The entire work will require lot of perseverance because in public activity involving large numbers there is always scope for misunderstandings. Our greatest need today is unity so the effort has to be moderate, not strict. Always be courteous and soft spoken!

The letter closes with reassurance that he has no personal discomfort and confidence that:

> We are every day approaching close to the objective of India's freedom and our religious objective. The people and the country are marching ahead fast.

At a time when jail-going had become the highest political merit the friends and admirers of the jail-goers were keen to treat them as celebrities. Both at the time of arrest and at the time of release they were taken round in procession. On hearing about the release of Maulana Husain Ahmed there was tremendous excitement in Deoband and its surrounding areas. People wanted to bring him from the station in a huge procession.

They were all disappointed when they found that he had arrived at the residence with prior information to anybody. On release in Ahmedabad he had boarded the train to Deoband where it arrived just after the midnight hour, at 2 o'clock.[39] Maulana was averse to any celebrations in his honour but was ever ready to come to a platform from which he could hurl defiance at the British and communicate the message of non-cooperation and swaraj as he had done at Karachi. He was already in great demand for addressing conferences organised by Jamiat Ulama that had spearheaded the Khilafat Movement. After the Karachi incarceration he was all the greater attraction for conferences. Soon after his release he was elected to preside over the 5th annual session of the Jamiat to be held at Cocanada (now in Andhra but then in Madras presidency). Significantly, the session was being held simultaneously with the Congress session that was to be presided over by Maulana Mohammad Ali. The Maulana calls upon the Muslims and the leaders of the community to put all their might against the British and refuse to give them any kind of cooperation.

Maulana Husain Ahmad adopted Jamiat as his main platform for creating political awakening among Muslims. His speeches therefore often began with description of the injustices inflicted on the Islamic world by the European powers spearheaded by Britain. On that basis he argued the case for Muslims cooperating enthusiastically with forces that had taken up

cudgels against these marauding forces that threatened their very existence as Muslims. His presidential address at the Cocanada session is typical of his approach. It starts with recounting the events showing the hostile attitude of the British, the account running into 12 pages.

Then follows the exhortation for non-cooperation with the British and cause them as much damage as possible. Here are some of the excerpts:

(1) The evil British policy uses Indian army to loot and plunder Muslim nations. If a soldier performance this duty as legitimate action he would, in terms of Islamic jurisprudence, be considered an infidel. And, if despite knowing it is illegitimate, he does it out of fear or worldly allurement he would be guilty of the worst sin; his penitence will not be accepted and he would never be relieved of the hellfire. This is evident from a whole lot of Sayings of the Prophet as also numerous Verdicts pronounced by jurists. Yet the poor indigent Muslims feel compelled to join the army and commit these unpardonable sins. Their salvation therefore lies only in India’s independence.

(2) As part of this evil policy to ruin Muslims in other countries inhabitants of India are asked to make financial contributions and give donations. According to Islamic law this kind of help to

infidels is also illegitimate and those rendering such help are guilty of serious sinful act. Freedom from this crime is also possible if India is free.

(3) (Following versus of Sura Buqra and Sura Tauba are cited:

(a) Those who are at war with you, fight against them in the path of God and Faith;

(b) Just as polytheists unite to fight against you, you unite to fight against them;

(c) Fight the infidels close to you so that they feel your powr and intensity of feeling.)

On this basis conclusion is drawn:

> Because of the above-mentioned evil policy and your inevitable duty to confront this government and every effort made to bring down its prestige and weaken its power, its designs and plans should be rendered hollow and ineffective. To break its arrogance and regime of oppression is the religious duty of every Mussalman. That is the best struggle because it would defeat him. India's complete independence and swaraj is tantamount to the death of British power.

Another excerpt runs:

> Therefore our primary, important and inevitable duty is to oppose this sinister policy with all the power and determination. At a time when especially all the legal efforts have proved ineffective it is the entire move necessary that we force this government to give up this dirty policy and make it our main goal, not sit quiet and not let this government rest in peace till the objective is achieved.

The objective, he explains, is not only the safety of the holy places of Islam or for the benefit of Indian Muslims alone but for the whole of India, nay, for the whole of India and indeed for entire East against the West.[40]

Besides, there was a problem of earning for his family. He was averse to accepting a dole or an occupation that would remove him from the political scene. Fareedul Waheedi has cursorily mentioned some offers, one for a professorship at Dacca University and the other from Al-Azhar University of Cairo, which he was supposed to have rejected. The mention is cursory because the writer has found no authentic corroboration for what some admirers of Maulana had told him. Yet, people believed and tradition knowing as they did his commitment to his principles so that no worldly temptation could divert him from his chose path. Meanwhile he got a call from Sylhet district of Assam that he should start a school of *Hadith* there. He had visited the place while teaching at Madarsa in Calcutta and participated in the conferences of Congress and Jamiat. On account of that

activity there had grown a large section of his admirers and followers. The offer was to his taste and suited his temperament being in line with his broad mission. So, he made Sylhet his centre of activity, both academic and political. His teaching there continued from December 1924 till 1927 when he was called to take over guidance of his almamater Darul Uloom Deoband. At a time when his popularity in that area was at its zenith he was called upon to leave Sylhet and join Darul Uloom.[41]

According to Mohammad Miyan, 1927 was the first year in the history of Darul Uloom when it faced a maelstrom of mutual differences and recriminations. The students started the trend of going on strike and the teachers got divided into two hostile groups. Old students and associates also got divided. The institution was in a deep crisis and salvaging its prestige was no child's play because veterans like Allama Anwar Shah Kashmiri and Mufti Azizurrehman could not remain unaffected.

The reason behind the crisis has not been mentioned by most of the biographers of Maulana Husain Ahmad including Syed Mohammad Miyan, the most authentic of them, who has served as the source of most writers on Deoband and its leading personalities. Maulana's grand nephew Fareedul Waheedi has thrown light on the episode in his biography published in 1992.The situation was saved by the wise choice of Husain Ahmad to take the place of Allama Anwar Shah. He demanded that there would be no

restriction on his activity in the service to the country and movements connected with it. He should be allowed to participate in national movement related agitation without seeking prior permission. The conditions were accepted, that brought to an end the recriminatory confrontation and all well-wishers of the madarsa heaved a sigh of relief.[42]

In 1921 when they arrived from Malta civil Disobedience movement has been withdrawn because of violence at Chaura Chauri. As a result there was all-round demoralization. In 1922 Gandhi was clamped in jail which removed from the scene the main motivating force from united anti-British struggle. Swai Shraddhanand, a prominent leader of non-cooperation movement, was released. What transpired between him and the government has remained a mystery but soon after his release Shraddhanand launched *shuddhi* movement. About the same time Dr. Moonje launched what he called the Hindu Sangathan which later took militant communal form. On the other hand Sir Fazle Husain, the Punjab Education Minister, gave a call for propagation of Islam among Rajputs who were vulnerable to re-conversion. That confrontation triggered a wave of communal riots that put the politics of the country in reverse gear. Hindus and Muslims, who had joined forces in the wake of 1918-1919 incidents and were prepared to make sacrifices for one another, developed mutual suspicions. There was a spate of

communal riots to stop which Gandhi, still in prison, undertook a fast unto death.

Maulana Husain Ahmad was one of those who remained steadfast in those trying times. He carried on his agitation from the platform mainly of Jamiat Ulama Hind. He analysed the situation and came to the following conclusion:

(1) The country is in the grip of a power on whose empire the sun never sets. It has unlimited resources and power as against which Indians are unarmed and take fright from the sound of gun. All hope of outside help from Turkey, Germany etc. is lost. There is only one weapon, boycott and non-cooperation. That requires unity of people. At present the 'divide and rule' policy is at play but it can be overcome if the nation develops sensitivity to its backwardness, ruination and humiliation.

(2) Enthusiasm for boycott had come up during the Khilafat movement but it was based on religious sentiment roused by the British treatment of Turks, it was not hatred of economic plunder and slavery of India. It is therefore necessary to develop sensitivity to these concrete material injustices so that the next step may be stable.

(3) Europe had seen several revolutions triggered by economic reasons. But domination of America was brought to an end with the weapon of boycott and non-cooperation. America had been colonized by the white European emigrants and the British had gained power there with its clever diplomacy. The Europeans did not like this and drove the British out with this weapon of non-cooperation.

(4) Boycott of person is meaningless. Boycott of British industrial goods would be effective because that is its life line. The companions of Sheikh-ul- Hind had discovered this strategy in the beginning of 20th century as is evident from the CID recording the inclination to wearing khaddar in its report on so called 'Silk-Letters Conspiracy'. After the war Gandhi adopted the same weapon.

His speeches and writing reflect that on the basis of his understanding of the situation he had put before him the following programme:

(1) Unity must be forged if flight for independence has to be conducted by non-violent means, other means being beyond the reach of Indians.

(2) Muslims must be motivated to participate in freedom struggle along with Hindus if they have to secure an honourable position in independent India.

(3) Congress being the main instrument for the liberation struggle it should be strengthened and made sensitive to the religious sensibilities of Muslims. He himself joined it to set the example.

This line of action could be the best strategy to meet the challenge of the 'divide and rule' strategy that was in operation. His speeches therefore lay emphasis on economic issues along with reminding the Muslims of their religious duty to oppose the British. His appeal was not to religious sentiment along but also to the plight to which India had been reduced by the British. He had collected facts and figures about how prosperous India was and to what state of destitution she had been reduced. The aim was to direct the mind of Muslims from exclusively religious issues to secular issues which were the surer foundation for long-term sustained unity.

For a number of years this new style of the Maulana was not found palatable by his largely Muslims audience used to expecting from his discourses replete with quotations from the Quran and Hadith. They found cold statistics about the economy of the country boring and would often leave the meeting as soon as he started mentioning them. The Maulana however

did not feel discouraged by the behaviour; he behaved like an affectionate teacher who shows perseverance to bring the pupil round to being attentive. Convinced that he was on the right path he was determined to carry conviction to others because that was the only way to save the Muslims community from the disaster that would be the inevitable result of separatism preached by the Muslim League.

The Maulana was particular about practicing what he preached and would not tolerate use of any article not produced in India. Non-cooperation for him was not a mere slogan but way of life. If people out of reverence offered him foreign made soap he would not touch it. If he agreed to lead the prayer and found that the prayer carpet was not indigenous he would remove it and offer prayer on a straw carpet.[43]

The appointment of Simon Commission to make recommendations about constitutional reforms to satisfy the rising aspirations of the Indians provided opportunity to revive the old spirit. It was taken as a challenge to the ability and acumen of the Indian leadership that a group of British politicians should decide how India should be administered. Besides, how could promises of the same British Government trusted which had a dismal record of betrayals? Both Congress and Jamiat-e- Ulama decided to boycott the commission.

The Secretary of State for India Lord Birkenhead had declared that if Indians themselves prepare an agreed constitution the Commission would be pleased to accept it. Consequently efforts started in that direction. In 1929 an All Parties Conference was held in Delhi under the chairmanship of his Highness Sir Agha Khan, the gentleman who had led the deputation to the viceroy in 1906 that led to the formation of Muslim League as a move to counter the Congress challenge to imperial authority. It passed lengthy resolution which included all the 14 points on the basis of which Mr. Jinnah had agreed to cooperate with the Congress; the agreement is well known as the Lucknow Pact.

On its part the Congress set up a committee under the chairmanship of Moti Lal Nehru. It proposed a set of constitutional reforms that it hoped would be acceptable to all parties but unfortunately it did not get approval of any party though the Congress Party being the creator of the Committee had no option but to accept the report named after its hairman. Jamiat-e- Ulama that had been working shoulder to shoulder with the Congress also could not endorse it because it demanded Dominion Status for India while the Jamiat was irrevocably committed to demand for complete independence.

Later in December 1929 when the Congress moved on to adopting complete independence as its goal Jamiat felt that it made

incumbent upon every Muslim to fully cooperate with it. On March 13, 1930 Gandhi started Dandi March as a protest against salt laws. It was the resumption of the non-cooperation movement that had earlier been suspended. Jamiat could not keep aloof. Following these developments Jamiat called its session at Amroha to call upon the Muslims to join the Congress, its only difference having been removed.

It was a subject of sharp controversy. Maulana Mohammad Ali, who was identified with the Khilafat movement, was worried about his personal position and prestige after the decline of that movement and wanted to capture the platform of Jamiat for his political rehabilitation. The difficulty was that its president had to be an *aalim* (Islamic scholar) which Mohammad Ali was not. His admirers in Kanpur, in order to overcome the disability, convened a meeting of the Jamiat Working Committee and decided to hold a session of the organization under the chairmanship of Mohammad Ali. This illegal process to capture the organization could not be tolerated and a regular meeting of the Working Committee declared it ultra virus. Maulana Husain Ahmad supported the decision despite his long-standing friendship with Mohammad Ali because it was a matter of principle. The result was confusion in the community so that important people in big cities were reluctant to be associated with the official Jamiat session. That is why the session was held at Amroha rather than at a more prominent venue.

The rival Muslim leaders had given an attractive slogan ‘first pact, then participation in movement’ implying that there should be definite assurance of the share of the community in free India before they join hands with the Congress. Unfortunately Maulana Mohammad Ali also joined his voice with them.

Jamiat however was apprehensive that as long as the British were there to play their divisive game there could be no hope of any understanding on the question of relative position of the two communities in the new constitutional scheme. Besides, they were of opinion that there was no question of choosing between joining and not joining the movement; it had already been launched and the countrymen were on the move and if the Muslims did not join the struggle they might lose the right to make any demands in free India. They indeed were among those who had been insisting on the Congress adopting complete independence as its goal and had been opposed to any compromise less than that. Therefore, the Amroha session held under the chairmanship of Maulana Madni passed a resolution asserting that it is the duty of Muslims to join hands with the Congress while fully conforming to the commandments of *Shariat*. The resolution was moved by young Maulana Hafizurrehman and, before any other delegate should come forward to second it Maulana Madni himself seconded it and justified it in

terms of *Shariat* and described the struggle for independence as the demand of times.

That year the agitation did not last long because to cover the fiasco of Simon Commission the British Government had put forward the idea of a Round Table Conference. As the success of that move depended on participation of Congress Gandhi was released and invited for negotiations with the Viceroy Lord Irwin. Consequent upon the Gandhi-Irwin talks all political prisoners were released and the Congress decided to participate in the conference. Soon the liberal reasons Lord Irwin are replaced by the rigid conservatism of Lord Willingdon who packed the Indian delegation with non-Congress Muslims and reactionary Hindus. Gandhi wanted at least Dr. Ansari to be included but that demand was also not conceded giving rise to legitimate apprehension that the British were up to their old tricks. Gandhi was reluctant to go for the Conference but was persuaded by Congress Working Committee. As expected the Conference failed to produce any result and Gandhi came back disappointed to find India being ruled by repressive ordinances.

Gandhi was arrested within a week of his return and Congress was declared illegal by an ordinance. Congress Working Committee was disbanded and dictators nominated to defy the law and court arrest. Civil Disobedience started. Jamiat also followed suit and appointed dictators.

Maulana Madni was the sixth of the dictators who were arrested immediately after the names were declared. Maulana's programme was to go to Delhi and make a speech at Jama Masjid in defiance of the law. The police did not arrest him at Deoband station beause there was a huge crowd of admirers come to see him off. On the station next to Deoband, Rohana, the DSP showed him a notice that was written in English. Maulana responded saying he did not know English. The DSP asked him to lend his pen so that he could translate it into Urdu. The Maulana then said, "How funny! You want me to provide you the weapon to slaughter me!" Hearing this reply he went away. The train started. By the time it reached Muzaffar Nagar station the translation was ready and was presented. It was issued by the District Magistrate of Saharanpur. The Maulana thereupon brought to bear his legal knowledge and said, "I am out of the boundary of District Saharanpur. The notice issued by the DM of Saharanpur cannot be executed outside the limits of that district." The DM of Muzaffar Nagar also was there and he wrote another notice. The Maulana was brought down from the train and could not reach Delhi. As the date fixed for his *Satyagraha* had passed another name in his place was announced so that he was released.

On this episode Maulana Mohammad Miyan has commented:

> This resolve of the Maulana was also a kind of *jihad* (crusade). His feet were full of blisters which were running sores and it was difficult

for him to walk. Daily dressing was applied and the process was painful even to a witness but the Maulana never showed any kind of discomfort. Indeed, Maulana Anwar Shah had sent word that he should not proceed on the fixed date and change the date. But he did not want to lose the opportunity.

It has been mentioned above that leading personalities of the community had raised a reservation in respect of cooperation with Congress and had given an appealing slogan ‘assurance before cooperation’. The Maulana being the chief advocate of unconditional cooperation received several queries about its justification to which he gave detailed replies which are examples of his intellectual grasp and understanding of the problem.

In a letter to Hafiz Siddique of Chah Miranwala, Distt. Muzaffargarh (now in Pakistan), he gave the following reasons:

(1) The Holy Quran forbids Muslims from reconciling to slavery. It’s incumbent upon every Muslim to see that no Islamic country remains in the grip of infidels. Hence it is obligatory on Indian Muslims to employ every possible strategy to liberate the country. As violent struggle, it is generally agreed, is bound to be counterproductive; it is the religious duty of Muslims to use only civil disobedience. But such a struggle cannot be successful if

conducted by Muslims alone. They have therefore to join forces with non-Muslims. How far the independent country will follow the tenents of Islam will depend upon the capacity of Muslims to convince the compatriots of its utility through propagation. The country after liberation may not be based on Islamic laws but that would be a lesser evil than the present state of slavery.

(2) The constitution of free India would be democratic in which adequate safeguards for rights of Muslim community would be provided which he sums up as follows:

(i) Muslims will have effective share in the country's administration.

(ii) The Muslim Personal Law would be safeguarded and Muslims will be free to observe it.

(iii) Religious institutions of Muslims like Awkaf, mosques and graveyards will remain safe and their culture and civilization will not be interfered with.

(iv) In five out of eleven provinces there will be Muslim majority governments that will be autonomous in internal affairs like legislation, education, economic system and culture. Is this arrangement not beneficial for the interests of Muslims? All this is much more important than the conditions on which

> Islam has permitted sharing of power with non-Muslims. Hence active cooperation with non-Muslim organizations and communities is not only legitimate but also necessary.[44]

In 1936 arose the question of contesting elections under the Government of India Act of 1935. The Act provided for separate electorate for Muslims. The nationalist Muslims were apprehensive that they would not get elected easily under the separate electorate system and were therefore reluctant to contest under the banner of Congress. They had earlier achieved success through the platform of Unity Board, a broad of different Muslim organizations.

It is regrettable that after the League's electoral success the very first session of the League at Lucknow repudiated all promises and proclamations. Mr. Jinnah turned a votary of return to the League all those elements which he earlier wanted to get rid of and about whom it was well known that all their lives they had opposed the national movements and licked the shoes of the British. Besides, he behaved on several issues which disappointed us and there was no alternative but to part company. For example he opposed the Shariat Bill and the Qazi Bill and on the issue of divorce accepted the view of non-Muslim rulers, supported the Army Bill and so on.

The fact is that Mr. Jinnah was never serious about unity with nationalist Muslim organizations. As Chowdhary Khaliquzzaman has pointed out he had invited those organizations to impart credibility to Muslim League in the eyes of Muslim electorate. He had returned to Indian politics after his exit with a brief from the conservative British politicians to play their 'divide and rule' game. Neither Congress nor nationalist Muslims tried to go into this aspect of his career after ther 1931 Round Table Conference beause they were too eager to present a united frong of Indian communities.[45]

Jinnah's betrayal was a great disappointment for the Maulana as a consequence of Mr. Jinnah's betrayal of his efforts to integrate him and the Muslim League with the mainstream of national struggle put him in direct confrontation with the politics of the latter. It was a bitter struggle and Maulana had to virtually carry on a sort of *jihad* for the whole decade between 1937 and 1947. His address at Jaunpur session of the Jamiat was a declaration of confrontation with the League and exhortation to *ulama* to fight out the sinister move and save the community. It was the worst tragedy of Islam and Muslims in the 20th century because Partition created seemingly never-ending problems for Muslims of the sub-continent and deprived the community of opportunity to add to the history of Islam an example of honourable existence as minority and coexistence with non-Muslims.

The differences of Maulana with Mr. Jinnah were not personal but purely political. For Jinnah Congress was the main enemy of the community and could not be expected to be fair to the Muslim interests. On the other hand the British could and should be relied upon to safeguard Muslim interests from the 'tyranny of Hindu majority'. As against this the Maulana was of opinion that (a) the British were the worst enemy of worldwide Muslim community, (b) liberation of India would break the imperialist British chain that held in thrall India as well as the Muslim world and (c) cooperation with Hindus was lesser evil because Hindus would not cause as much damage to Islam and Muslims as did the British.

It was to clear his position that he wrote the pamphlet exposing the character of Mr. Jinnah in the following words:

> His (Jinnah's) political weakness is manifest in the fest in the fact that he was with Congress till its Nagpur session and parted company with it only when it passed the resolution on non-cooperation. In his Lucknow presidential address at the League Conference he dubbed non-cooperation or civil disobedience as national suicide. On that and other bases late Dr. Ansari had said he was no friend of India and was a communalist. The same was the reason for the unpleasantness with Ali Brothers at Calcutta. However his conduct in Central Assembly in

1924 had roused hopes that he had changed …. but his post-election role proved disappointing….

How weak is his political conviction was manifest in the Lucknow Pact that he had signed as president of Muslim League and big leaders were under detention. The Ulama till then were not in politics and he disturbed the balance of Muslims in politics. Their majority was not recognized in any place.

How Mr. Jinnah worked against Indian interests and what havoc his role played became clear in the course of World War II.[46]

MAULANA'S SECRET ACTIVITY

Maulana had not offered himself for arrest as part of individual *Satyagraha* movement though he did get arrested in those days but that was on account of an anti-war speech. However, he had launched another kind of secret activity as Jamiat's contribution to mass awareness about the injustice being done to India by dragging her into war. The evidence is found in a hand-written letter that was sent to Maulana Khuda Bakhsh of Multan. Titled *Zaroori Guzarish* (important request), it reads:

Read the programme of Jamiat Ulama yourself and read it to others plus do your duty by helping its wider reach. If you are unable to get it

printed yourself or through local Congress, keep a copy and give it to some other person:

Common Programme of Congress and Jamiat Ulama

Immense amount of gold has been sent out from India and mortgaged to America. You may or may not be a supporter of Congress but you must take care of your assets. If you are opposed to the movement you are not being asked to support it or to make any sacrifice. You are simply being advised to save yourself from a deceptive action and not waste your wealth in exchange for useless paper currency. The British power has no credibility, so is the position of its currency notes. Hence, if you want to safeguard your wealth-

(1) Don't accept any currency note, particularly the one rupee and five rupee ones.

(2) Against all the currency notes that you possess buy one rupee coins, gold or silver.

(3) Don't sell any commodity against notes. The farmers in rural areas should make sure that they would not be made payment in the form of notes.[47]

The war was getting prolonged and problems of people were getting aggravated so that popular discontent was rising and demand for

independence was gaining strength. In order to mitigate the effect of this discontent the Crown made a gesture of conciliation in the form of Cripps mission. It was like the dispatch of the Simon Commission earlier. All parties were involved in discussion about a viable basis for cooperation in the war effort. The mission had put forward a formula on which the parties were giving their reactions. The Jamiat held a session at Lahore at which a resolution on the mission its proposals was adopted. Gist of the resolution and the formula is as follows:

> The arrival of Cripps Mission and its proposals both are outdated. Nothing less than complete independence would be acceptable. The Muslim institutions and parties should work in cooperation with one another and evolve a consensus.

The formula that was adopted had four basic points:

(1) Complete independence.

(2) National independence, which guarantees safeguards for religion and culture of Muslims.

(3) Provinces should have fully autonomy and Centre should be given only those rights, which provinces agree to delegate to it. The undefined jurisdiction should be that of provinces.

(4) India should be a federation so constituted that the Muslims should be secure regarding their religious, political-cultural rights; they should not be at the mercy of any numerical majority.

As against this the proposal of Cripps Mission was on following lines:

> India should be an independent dominion under the British Crown and should not be subservient to any power in internal and external affairs. The provinces should enjoy full autonomy and should have the right, if they want, to keep out of the Dominion and continue under the British Crown. A Constituent Assembly should be elected to prepare a Constitution for the entire country. The British Government should endorse this Constitution.

These proposals sounded attractive but it was, in the words of Gandhi, “a post-dated cheque on a bank with a bleak future”. It meant that India should made sacrifices on vague hopes that might turn out to be false. That was not only past experience of three centuries but also current experience in the form of Bengal Famine in which, according to the Secretary of State for India, 1.9 million people had perished.

Cripps Mission stayed for two weeks but had to return empty-handed as no party was prepared to accept its proposals. As the freedom movement gathered strength the government restored to repression.[48]

With Maulana's intrepid advocacy of complete independence and irrefutable logic of his opposition to the British it was unthinkable that Maulana Husain Ahmad should escape the repression unleashed against the advocates of freedom. He was arrested even before the Quit India resolution of the Congress.

A warrant for his arrest was issued for making a speech at the conference of Moradabad District branch of Jamiat held on 23-25 April 1942. As his arrest at Deoband could be hazardous for the authorities he was arrested two months later, on June 24, at Tilhari that falls between Deoband and Saharanpur The period of six months' imprisonment was to end on January 4, 1943 but on the eve of the date of release he was served notice under Defence of India Rules involving jail term for indefinite period.

From Naini prison he was released on August 26, 1944. Thus this time he spent two years, two months and two days in prison.[49] The prison life had taken a toll of his health. He had lost 40 pounds of weight and looked very weak. All that however did not deter him from complying with the requests of his followers and admirers. As far as humanly possible he never declined any invitation. As soon as he was released there were invitations for addressing meetings at various places. He presided over Saharanpur session from 4 to 7 May, 1945. The Saharanpur address has a special significance as an elaborate statement of his vision of freedom.

The address was Jamiat's declaration of continued non-cooperation with the British government and support to the nationalist cause spearheaded by the Congress. The Maulana however took care to precisely define the nature of relationship with the Congress. It was not a relation of subservience but cooperation for a common cause. In his opinion the Congress, despite its membership being predominantly Hindu, rule would not be as inimical to Islam as was the record of the British.

The Saharanpur session also considered the detailed explanation of the formula for future Constitution of India suggested at Lahore session. It was adopted in all detail with an overwhelming majority of delegates, only 30 votes against from among 500 members and delegates. The final formula later came to be known as Madni Formula. It read:

> Although the Lahore resolution in this respect is quite clear in terms of principle and that Jamiat is not prepared to compromise on the issue of religious, political and cultural freedom for Muslims, it does agree with the federal centre for India because in its opinion united India is more in the interest of people, especially of Muslims, but federal government is accepted on condition that the principle of self-determination for provinces be accepted and the federal centre be so constituted that a majority is not in a position to ride roughshod over the religious, political and cultural rights of Muslims. By mutual

agreement either one of the following proposals or another mutually acceptable arrangement should be decided:

(1) For instance, the portion of representatives in the federal house should be Hindus 45, Muslims 45 and other minorities 10.

(2) If two thirds of Muslim members deem a certain bill or resolution contrary to the political or religious freedom of the community or to its culture it should either not be presented and if put up, not passed.

(3) A Supreme Court be established that should be constituted by equal number of representatives from Muslim and non-Muslim provinces and which should comprise of equal number of Muslim and non-Muslim judges. That Supreme Court will decide all disputes between centre and provinces as also between different provinces and different communities. Besides, in case in accordance with proposal 2, the majority at the Centre does not agree with the view of two thirds of the Muslim members, the final decision is left to that Supreme Court. Or

(4) Any other proposal that the parties concerned may decide upon by consensus.[50]

In place of Wavell was sent Mountbatten who came with the specific instruction to arrange for quitting India at the earliest even if it involves Partition. He came to India on March 22, 1947 with the proclamation of the objective of His Majesty's government that;

> As far as possible the country should be kept united but if that be not possible, to save from the debris whatever was possible. In short Britain should be relieved of India as soon as possible.

Once again there is no escape from the conclusion that the British government was bent upon partitioning the country because that was in the best interests of their country. The British wreaked vengeance on Indian people by encouraging the rowdy elements in both communities to create a situation in which the Indian leaders might feel compelled to request the departing British to stay on, Maulana Madni has described the scenario that appeared in detail in his presidential address at the Lucknow session of Jamiat held on 26-27 April 1948 i.e. just 8 months after partitioned independence. In his opinion it showed the bankruptcy of Jinnah's politics. Here are some excerpts from it:

> On June 3, 1947 Partition plan was announced. It granted to Mr. Jinnah the 'Pakistan' that Mr. Rajagopal Acharya had proposed in 1944 on the basis of which Gandhi-Jinnah talk were held for a full

fortnight and that Mr. Jinnah had rejected as lame and moth-eaten. Perhaps ruination of millions was the other leg and substance of the Pakistan that he demanded….

On August 7, 1947 Mr. Jenkins, Commissioner of Punjab C.I.D. wrote from Punjab Club, Lahore a secret letter to a senior officer of British intelligence that was somehow intercepted in London and got published in newspapers.

Mr. Jenkins had written:

> It is expected that the decision of the Boundary Commission would create anxiety among Muslims. If that happens, I think Muslims would like to stay under British protection.

Commenting on this the Pakistan Times wrote :

> Not much needs be said about the attitude of the former Governor of Punjab. The letter shows that the sources of most of our problems are our erstwhile rulers. At the time that the British were negotiating with our leaders the mode of transfer of power, these British bureaucrats were creating a network of secret agents…

The Maulana then quotes Pt. Sunder Lal, the emissary of Mahatma Gandhi to Punjab who wrote in the *Qaumi Awaz* of November 30, 1947:

> I am sure it will not be difficult to prove before an independent court that all the weaponry and ammunition used or to be used at different places by Hindus, Muslims or Sikhs had come through responsible British officers.

Muslim Deputy Commissioner Lyalpur told the Hindu chairman of local District Board if Col. Fenge is removed from the district not a single Hindu or Sikh would be looted.

In Lyalpur itself a British army officer told people they were wrong if they thought they were quitting finally.

> We would go and hide in the jungles of Malaya and when the situation here worsens we shall come back. There are numerous examples of authoritative British officers not only providing facilities for spreading riots but also to keep the fire burning. We are confessing with shame that we are evil whereas neither Hindus nor Muslims nor Sikhs are as evil as we consider one another.

Similar reports of the perfidy of British officers are cited showing their role in Central Provinces (C.P.). Newspaper *Hind* of Calcutta, for instance, reported that Prime Minister Ravi Shankar Shukla in Central Provinces had shown great courage in arresting such officers who were regularly providing weapons to the rioters from the ordnance factory at Jabbalpur. Search in the

houses of Lt. Col. Jones and Mr. Powell of Special Forces disclosed a store of rifles, revolvers and guns. Search at the houses of two police inspectors and of Maj. General Boxan also gave the same results.

From several quoted and unquoted instances the Maulana derived the conclusion that the secret agents of Tory Party were working overtime to sabotage the fruitful culmination of India's struggle for freedom. Their worst deed was their hand in the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi who was working to undo the work of these mischievous characters by creating confidence in minorities on both sides and defeating the conspiracy to effect exchange of population.

Having described the situation of the partition Maulana rendered advice about the proper conduct worthy of true Muslims. He had already made clear that they had to think only of those who had opted to link their future with Indian Union where they would be a minority. For this he reminds the community not to worry about numbers and concentrate on their own moral character and conduct. Referring to the growth of adherents to Islam in India he said that the number of Muslims that are seen in India are not the result of the pomp and glory of the Muslim rule but of the pious conduct of those men of God who presented themselves as models of the lofty teachings of Islam and made a place in the hearts of others. Those pious souls did not usurp the lands of others but conquered the hearts with their

qualities of head and heart. Moving according to their example if Muslims correctly follow the teachings of the Quran, history can repeat itself.[51]

Two years after independence Muslims were still facing acute problems of insecurity. In those circumstances the 16th annual session of Jamiat was held at Lucknow. In his address Maulana explained that the tragedy of Partition was the result of political conspiracy of the British that created a situation in which Congress also felt compelled to agree to it though Jamiat had the proud distinction of not accepting it.

He advised the community to rise above the adversity and think of their role in free India. His advice was that they should attend to acquisition of knowledge and skills that would compel the government and the people to recognize their value for national development.

For developing better understanding among various communities it advocated that all Indians should learn Hindi and Urdu. In this context he referred to the havoc played by distortion of history by British historians and suggested:

> Today we are building a new India on the basis of sincerity, morality and humanity and this task obliges us to reform this distorted history and highlight the moral values of India.

On the question of the future of Muslims in India he said:

> India is a democratic and secular country so that nobody can usurp your rights if you are deserving and capable… I tell you a basic principle. If you have courage, determination and diligence all the development blessings are available to you but if you are bereft of them nothing can help you.[52]

To achieve India's independence was the only purpose of Maulana Madni's participation in political life. For him it was both his patriotic duty as well as his duty as a preacher of the message of Islam. Presiding over the Bombay session of Jamiat-e- Ulama Maulana announced the decision to renounce political activity by the Jamiat in the following words:

> Jamiat-e-ulema-e-Hind has always believed in the efficacy and appropriateness of Hindu-Muslim cooperation in politics. India has never been divided on political and country-related issues. Muslim rulers may have headed its government or Hindu kings but neither of them ever betrayed any discrimination on communal basis.
>
> On August 15, 1947 when India became free to determine its fate and the Constituent Assembly put an end to separate electorate, the Jamiat-e- Ulama were naturally absolved of the responsibility that it had per force assumed. Hence its Working Committee meeting on February 1,

> 1947 declared that in future Jamiat would confine itself to the religious, cultural and educational sphere and, now onwards, this is the final resolve of the Jamiat-e- Ulama Hind.

The resolution indicates that the organization that Maulana had been serving and guiding for the last more than a quarter century had taken to politics not as its normal vocation but as a compulsion of circumstances and with the change of those compelling circumstances it had resolved to keep away from politics. Such a decision could not have been taken unless the Maulana himself had wanted. That means Maulana was determined to stick to the age-old practice of the Islamic scholars to confine themselves to guiding society on the path laid down by the Quran and Hadith while shunning direct role in administrating it.[53]

References:

1. Anil Saxena (ed) Encylopedia [of] history of India (2006) Vol.30,P.4, Anmol Publication Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.

2. Ibid. PP.6-7.

3. P.N.Chopra, Role of Indian Muslims in the Struggle for freedom (1979), P.(ii) published by Light and Life publishers, Paharganj, New Delhi.

4. Jagannath Patnaik, British Rule in India (1976) PP.164-173, Published by S.Chand and Company, Ram Nagar, New Delhi.

   See also: Ulema-i-Hind Ka Shandar Mazi, by Maulana Mohd. Miya.

5. Santimoy Ray, Freedom Movement and Indian Muslims, (1983), PP.1-3, Published by People's Publishing house, New Delhi.

6. Op.cit. P.N. Chopra, P.ii.

7. Op.cit. P.N. Chopra, P.iii.

8. Abdul Quddus Hashmi Nadvi, Pakistan aur Hindus (1941), PP.60-61, Published by Dar-ul-Ishat Siyasi, Usmani Road, Hyderabad (Deccan).

9. Ibid. PP.62-65.

10. Op.cit. Santimoy Ray, PP-28-38.

11. Dr. Tara Chand, History of the Freedom Movement in India, Vol.II, PP.200-208, Published by Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India.

12. Mohd. Salmaan Mansoorpuri, Tahrike-Azadi-e-Hind Mein Muslim Ulema Aur Awaam ka Kirdar (1998) PP.70-83, Published by Zam Zam Book Depot, Deoband.
See also : Tahrik-e-Reshmi Rumal.

13. Op.cit. Santimoy Ray, P.35.

14. Maulana Sayed Mohammed Miya Saheb, Aseeran-e-Malta (2002), PP.40-42, Published by Kutubkhana Naimiya, Deoband.

15. Maulana Sayyed Mohammed Miya, Tahrik Shaikh-ul-Hind, Record of Silk Letters Conspiracy Case (In the language of British Govt. PP.181,205-207,l-Jamiat Book Depot, Qasim Jaan Street, Delhi-6.

16. Qazi Moh Zahed-ul-Husaini, Chirag-e-Mohammed (2003), P.73, Published by Al-Jamiat Book Depot, Delhi-6.

17. Op.cit. Santimoy Ray, P.39.

18. Sayed Ibrahim, Fikri, Hindustani Musalmano Ka Jang-e-Azadi Mein Hissa (1997), PP.349-352, Published by Maktaba Jamia Ltd. New Delhi – 110025.

19. B.K. Ahluwalia & Shashi Ahluwalia, Muslims and India’s Freedom Movement (1985), PP.248-250, Published by Heritage Publishers, 4C, Ansari Road, Darya Ganj, New Delhi.

20. Meva Ram Gupta Saturya, Hindustan Ki Jang-e-Azadi ke Musalmaan Mujahedeen (Dec. 1988), PP.105-196, Published by Idara Shaheedan-e-Watan Prakashan, Mumbai.

21. Op.cit. Santimoy Ray, PP.48-50.

22. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, India Wins Freedom (1959), PP.8-9, Published by Orient Longman ……………………….

23. Op.cit. P.N.Chopra, PP.93-95.

24. Zafar Ahmed Nizami, Builders of Modern India (Hakim Ajmal Khan) (1988)(P.vii), published by The Director Publications Division Ministry of -Information and Broadcasting government of India, New Delhi 110001.

25. Ibid. PP.131-132.

26. Ibid. PP.135-137.

27. Ibid. PP.138-145.

28. Mushirul Hasan, Builders of Modern India, M.A. Ansari (1995), P-2-20, published by the Ministry of India, Patiala house, New Delhi.

29. Ibid. PP.23-24.

30. Ibid. PP.52-57.

31. Op. cit. Aseeran-e-Malta, PP.19-25.

32. Naqsh-e-Hayat, Autobiography of Maulana Husain Ahmed Madni, Part II (1999) PP.306-7, Published by Maktaba Diniya, Deoband.

33. Op. cit. Aseeran-e-Malta, PP.97-98.

34. Op. cit. Aseeran-e-Malta, PP.75-76.

35. Chirag-e-Mohammed, biography of Maulana Husain Ahmed Madni, edited by Qazi Mohd. Zahed-ul-Husaini, PP.101-104, Third edition (2003) published by Al-Jamiat Book Depot, New Delhi.

36. Ibid. PP.94-95.

37. D.R. Goyal, A biography of Maulana Husain Ahmed Madni (2004) PP.105-108, Pub. By Anamica Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi.

38. Op. cit. Chirag-e-Mohammed, PP.108-112.

39. Ibid. PP. 111-115.

40. Ibid. P. 117.

41. Ibid. P.122.

42. Op. cit. Maulana Sayed Mohammed Miya Saheb, PP.166-167.

43. Op. cit. Naqsh-e-Hayat, Vol.II. PP.163-164,
Letter No.134, Maktubat-e-Shaikh-ul-Islam (2012), Maulana Najmuddin Islahi (Ed.), PP.362-367, Published by Al-Jamiat B. Depot, New Delhi.

44. Op. cit. Aseeran-e-Malta, PP.180-186, Letter

45. Op.cit. D.R. Goyal, PP.153-161.

46. Ibid. PP.179-181.

47. Letter 143 in Maktubat-e-Shaikh-ul-Islam, Maulana Najmuddin Islahi (Ed.), P.301, Vol. IV, (2012) Published by Al-Jamiat B. Depot, New Delhi.

48. Op. cit. Aseeran-e-Malta, PP.225-251.

49. Maulana Mohd. Miya Saheb, Ulema-e-Haq, Vol.II (2008) PP.151-154, Faisal Publications, Jama Masjid, Deoband.

50. Ibid, PP.160-164.

51. Op. cit. D.R. Goyal, PP. 229-231.

52. Ibid. P.246.

53. Op. cit. Chirag-e-Mohammed, P.258.

CHAPTER – 4

POLITICAL IDEAS
OF
HUSAIN AHMED MADANI

Husain Ahmed Madani, the Deobandi Scholar, mostly known for his political activism. His political ideas reflect the ups and downs of the past and witness of his patience and perserverance in unfavourable circumstances. To him, politics does not accomplish only through philosophies, history is also necessary for it. His political ideas opened hidden corners of history from where the politics of sub-continent turns to the existing unpalatable state of affairs.[1]

Husain Ahmad had entered the field of politics at the instance of his revered teacher and leader Mahmud al Hasan. But his politics was not emotional. He had an intellectual approach to the problems of society. This is amply proved by his writings on India's politics and economics and on international affairs.

On religious matters his knowledge was outstanding. But it is amazing how a Maulavi had gathered a vast amount of information on the

political and economic history of India and on the international relations of the western powers with Islamic countries. There is no doubt that his residence in Mecca-the hub of the Muslim world, for over a decade and a half and his incarceration in Malta for nearly five years, brought him into contact with many men from Muslim countries as well as Europeans-Germans, Austrians, Italians and others, from whom he learnt a great deal of international affairs.[2]

On the basis of facts based on study and personal observation Maulana showed that European Powers, in particular Britain, were mainly responsible for the decline and disintegration of Islamic countries and the Khilafat. Conspiracies were hatched to shatter their unity because Islam was seen as a major world force. The main aim behind these conspiracies, he argued, was to strengthen their hold over India. It proved that freedom of India was the key to the revival of Islamic power and glory.

Success of India's struggle for freedom depended upon unity of the Hindus and Muslims, indeed all communities of India. As a way to consolidate that unity he recommended the course followed by leaders like Mahatma Gandhi and Maulana Shaukat Ali at the annual session of Jamiat Ulama at Delhi saying that they would not like to ignore any aspect of the religious problem. They had recommended complete freedom of religion for all Hindus as Hindus and Muslims retaining their faith without compromise.

They should work together for their rights and freedom. The unity he talked of was confined to secular area of activity leaving religious matters to each community to decide for itself without interference of others.

The speeches breathe Maulana's intense love for the country. He often pointed out that "it is natural that a person loves his homeland more than any other place on earth. The soil on which he is born and bred may be uncomfortable but the human mind accepts its thorns as flowers.[3]

Madani talked about the glorious past of India that, India was treated by the entire world as the source of knowledge and India was leader in the fields of arts, crafts and industries. And, he proceeds to demonstrate with the help of statistics how India's wealth and resources had been plundered, so much so that instead of exporting all variety of textiles the country was obliged to import cotton textiles worth 60 crores every year. He repeated the same argument in his Sehore address. He expressed pride in the past of India in following words that "India was cultured when the whole world was wild, she was source of knowledge and wisdom when ignorance was the lot of the rest of humanity, India was well fed at the time, when famine stalked the other parts of the world.[4]

Most comprehensive exposition of Maulana's political approach is found in his presidential address at the fifth session of the Jamiat

Ulama Hind held at Cocanada in December 1923. The address begins with a brief account of how Islamic power was driven out of Europe, how Arabs were incited to revolt against Turkey, how the Islamic institution of Khilafat was destroyed to shatter the unity and solidarity of Islamic countries and ultimately how the Arab world was divided into bits and distributed among the ambitious imperialists powers of Europe. For all these developments he holds Britain responsible than other partners of the conspiracies behind these events.

These events are of the period when civilization and culture had spread and Europe had laid claim to be civilized and supporter of peace and order. The leading role in this process was played by Great Britain which claims to be the most civilized and humanitarian nation. Most of the events, especially the latest were directed controlled and led by it though in several others its hand was not seen directly. From this the meanest intelligence can understand that while other European powers were inimical to Islam the attitude of Britain was most hostile towards Islam and Muslims and never missed an opportunity to damage them. Their recent attitude has been so brazenly blatant that even those simple-minded folk who were taken in by the glib talk of the British and trusted Britain to be a well-wisher and friend of Islam have now come to believe that the British pretension to friendship was also a mask for enmity to cause greater harm than the worst enemies could.

In this context he refers the names of Herbert Gladstone, Herbert Henry Asquith and Lord Kitchener whose derogatory remarks about Islam have been quoted from French journals by Al-Balagh of Beirut and Al-Hidayat of Constantinople avoiding repetition to save time.

The reason behind that hostility, in his opinion, was the European antagonism towards Islam in particular and the Orient in general whom they treated as uncivilized, less than human and undeserving of human rights. Its concrete manifestation he found in British attitude to India with which it established contact in 1600 A.D. "Initially", says he, "it confined its activities to trade alone but gradually it extended its tentacles in other fields including politics and in 1775 launched on a process of conquest. The East India Company rendered India lifeless and assumed the role of ruler on behalf of the British government. And, in 1858, the British government assumed direct control on the basis of a beautiful-looking golden declaration."[5]

Thereafter he refers to the uncivilized and barbaric methods used to uproot Islam and humiliate the Orient. Indians were pitted against Indians. Through cunning manoeuvres their development and economic resources were destroyed and they were put into such a process of education that left them caught in a web of superstition and immorality. Education was spread "just to avoid blame, to foster their own habits and practices and to

create instruments for dominance and enslavement of India”. Roads were built “only to consolidate their rule and to provide comfort to Europeans”. Railways and telegraph system were introduced “to serve their own trade interest, to capture entire market up to village level and to plunder all the resources of the country”. All these developments were meant also to facilitate the movement of troops in their expansionist territorial designs. India’s human, financial and natural resources were exploited and deployed to enslave other countries, besides strengthening its stranglehold on India’s human, financial and natural resources were exploited and deployed to enslave other countries, besides strengthening its stranglehold on India’s politics and economy. Laws were directed to oppress the seekers of justice and truth and to facilitate lining up the pockets of the Britishers. Clinching the argument he quotes Warren Hastings who had said, “The Englishman undergoes a transformation to become a new man. The crimes that did not even remotely touch him in England were used to promote the British cause”. He then exhorts the audience to oppose the British government resolutely and make its life impossible in every possible way. In this endeavour care, he emphasized, must be taken that the government’s policy of divide and rule does not succeed in damaging national solidarity.

The British have broken all promises made in the context of India as well as the holy places of Islam. It is therefore a religious as well as

political obligation of the Muslims to oppose them. In support of this contention he gives the following nine arguments:

1. The future security of the world of Islam and of Khilafat crucially depends on India's freedom so that its military strength and financial resources are under its own control. Otherwise they will be deployed in the holy places of Islam in the same old hostile fashion.

2. The Arab peninsula and the holy places of Islam have been captured with a view to consolidating British hold over India. The fact is acknowledged by British politicians themselves and can be easily understood by students of geography. It is therefore vitally important that India becomes free and the British need of controlling Arab peninsula and other places is obviated.

3. The British have used India's military resources to oppress and dishonour the Muslims everywhere and hence India's freedom is the key to getting rid of that sinister policy.

4. The voice of Indian Muslims in protest of hostile actions against Muslim holy places and Khilafat can be effective only if India is free. The reason is that India is a country with which all countries would like to have close relations. Therefore its voice is bound to be effective but only if it is free.

5. Indian Muslims render financial, strategic help or weapons only in conditions of freedom. Otherwise they cannot carry out this religious obligation.

6. In pursuit of their sinister political aims the British use Indian army and cause death and destruction in the Muslim world whereas, according to Islamic jurisprudence, it is the worst sin for a Muslim to kill or cause harm to other Muslims. Yet, economic compulsions force Indian Muslim to join the British Indian army. They can be saved from the sin if India is free.

7. As the British government collects funds in India for their hostile designs against Muslims of the world Indian Muslims who make contribution to these funds are committing a sin. In other words India's freedom is a precondition for protection of their religious commitment.

8. The present government of India violates tenets and commandments of Islam in several ways. Although a free democratic government of India cannot be expected to work strictly in conformity with Islamic tenets but it would certainly be a great improvement on the present situation.

9. The Quran says if your enemies' create a unified front against you, you also should build a similar unity with non-Muslims. [6]

An idea was moving in a section of Muslim population that, attainment of swaraj was political, not religious, issue and therefore the issue concerned only Hindus and not Muslims. The Maulana rebutted the contention with his normal practice of citing concrete facts of life. He pointed out that India is the homeland of Muslims as much as that of other communities' resident in the land and their material and spiritual development is intimately related to the conditions that prevail here and argued: "All the financial, economic and social harm that is suffered by others is suffered in a greater measure by Muslims. Therefore it is as much the duty of Muslims to throw away the shackles of slavery as it is of other communities. The present government is no protector of the human rights of Indians, nor does it bother about their country's welfare. It has no respect for their religious or national sentiments. Indians are given no respect either within India or outside. Other nations and governments also give no rights to Indians because they are slaves. The Government of India shows no concern for the trade, industry and education of Indians". He concluded it by exhorting the Muslims to not only work shoulder to shoulder with others for attainment of swaraj but be ahead of others in the struggle.

This being the case, how best can the Muslims carries out their obligation? Quoting a saying of the Prophet, he argues the case for Hindu-Muslim unity. According to the Prophet in a struggle against the enemy you have to adopt a course of action that would create awe in the adversary's mind and the only course for this is consolidation of the solidarity among various communities of India, in particular between the two major sections of the population, Hindus and Muslims.

In pursuing this course he, of course, has a word of caution: while joining them in action care should be taken not to neglect religious faith and its obligations. The communal unity is no transitory affair, as some people believe. Says the Maulana: "As this unity is based on the benefit and gain to India and Indians as also for the defence of their political and religious rights, it cannot be confined to a limited period. It is necessary as long as India and Indians are alive on this earth and as long as their religious and national rights are relevant". He argues that India being a multi-religious country, communal unity is imperative for sheer survival of its inhabitants, no matter whether they work for progress and prosperity and irrespective of the facts whether or not they are participating in the struggle for swaraj.[7]

Maulana shows serious concern over the impact of the *Shuddi* movement as it disrupts the Hindu-Muslim unity. In this respect his attitude is not extremist or communal but quite rational for a committed believer who

regarded the truth of Islam as the only truth. He recognizes the fact that since the time of Dayanand Saraswati thousands of Sanatanists, Muslims and Christians were being converted to Aryan faith but as contemporarily even the atheists are being accorded equal rights there can be no objection if propagation of faith is undertaken with a clear conscience and without any sinister ulterior motive. He left it to the leaders of the *Shuddhi* movement to decide for them whether they are acting in good faith and not proving an instrument in the hands of the usurpers of India's independence.

Regarding the responsibility of the Muslims in this context he says they must propagate their faith and save their co-religionists from falling victim to falsehood but, while doing that care must be taken "not to use derogatory words about the founder or leader of another faith, not to use force or material allurement, not to resort to uncultured behaviour." For this they must starte seminaries in every village to disseminate elementary education and the true Islamic conduct in their children.

He also points out the dangerous trend of the so called *sangathan* which ostensibly aims at organizing and reforming Hindu society. The Maulana does not oppose the effort as such because every religious community needs internal unity and reform but what he feels concerned about is the kind of propaganda indulged in by leaders of the movement for it has resulted in spreading the hatred, especially in Punjab and U.P.

Maulana was a member of the Congress that was the main toarch bearer of communal unity. He therefore considers it, his responsibility to point out the responsibility of its members in eradicating the poison that was being spread by these movements. His recommendations are:

1. Congress leaders and members must refrain from all such actions that are likely to generate hatred or disrupt unity.

2. It is the duty of leaders of both communities to reach the place of trouble as soon as possible and remove misunderstanding of the contending parties. Hindu leaders have to bear primary responsibility in this respect.

3. Each community has to show tolerance and respect for the other because peace and harmony cannot be maintained by one-sided action.

4. Any member of Congress found indulging in provocative action; speech or writing should be expelled from the organization.[9]

It was found that European nations, particularly Britain, have adopted hostile attitude towards all Orientals and treated them as less than human beings, unworthy of human rights.

Britain established contact with Indian sub-continent in early 1600 A.D., maintained trade relations for a long time and gradually

penetrated into politics and every other sphere of life. From 1757 onwards it started capturing territories and by 1832 East India Company became the ruler, rendering the country half dead in all respects. In 1858 the British Crown took over the administration direct in its own hands.

I do not want to go into details here. My only intention is to demonstrate that here too weapons unworthy of claimants of being civilized were used to oppress and humiliate Muslims and other Orientals. Differences were created between rulers and the ruled as also between different communities that inhabit this land. Power and prestige were destroyed by imposing one upon the other. To consolidate their oppressive rule they betrayed all their promises and lured people with false illusions and put Indians against one another. All kinds of strategies were used to destroy India’s trade and industry. The Indian assets, treasures and food grains were transferred elsewhere, they were subjected to brutal laws and ordinances and they were morally corrupt so that their minds were paralysed. Real education was denied to them and such education was imposed upon them which neither helped them to progress nor guided them to the right path. All their positive qualities were replaced by evil habits, knowledge by ignorance and superstition, prosperity into penury, bravery by cowardice, efficiency by laziness, truthfulness by falsehood, God-fearing piety by atheism, lofty thoughts by degenerate disposition. Such diplomacy and policy framework

were introduced that put back the progress of the country and its inhabitants for ever so that they could be rendered undeserving of human rights what to speak of making progess. There was no protection of their human and national rights, nor any respect for their religious and spiritual principles and practices. Today when every nation and every habitation is busy trying to shine on the horizon of progress India seems to sit helpless. Because its interests are being watched by the self-proclaimed high priests of peace and order!

In the context of disruption of communal unity by the *Shuddhi* movement launched by Shraddhanand he quoted the verse Sura-e-Ittesaal which means “Get ready as many horses and forces against the enemies of Islam so that you may put into them the fear of God and your power.” According to the verse, he said, “unity is essential for Muslims of India because Hindu-Muslim unity is the only deterrent for our enemy; only with this at our command can we inspire fear in him and melt his stony heart. As such this unity is not only legitimate but necessary”.

In this process he advised a caution in dealing with other hostile elements that may try to disrupt unity by spreading the poison of hatred for these new enemies may just be the bacteria bread by the old cunning enemy. Care has to be taken lest we fritter away our energies in mutual strife and leave the space for the main enemy to thrust its iron claws

deeper in our body politic. In this case we must show a sense of tolerance and forgiveness. If this policy does not work confrontation should be adopted only to necessary extent. The disruption of a few should not become the cause of punishment of the entire country.[10]

A change in the context for political activities came in the mid 1930s with the enlarged electorates and substantial extension of provincial autonomy granted by the 1935 Government of India Act. Congress won stunning victories, establishing ministries in seven provinces, including the United Provinces. There, however, the Muslim League had won all 29 of the reserved seats for Muslims and the Congress had won none. The decision not to include the League in a coalition, and a range of other perceived slights and policies, definitely alienated many of the Muslim leadership, including Maududi, from Congress support.

Madani's case was different. He had in fact supported Mohammad Ali Jinnah's Muslim League in the 1937 elections, a reflection of their shared devotion to Indian nationalism and to securing the interests of Muslims at a time when the vision of independence was still very fluid and the Congress and the League might still have found ways to cooperate. Jinnah had apparently made a commitment to shift the direction from the party away from its core support of aristocratic and-in Madani's view-pro-British members in favour of anti-British nationalists, including 'ulama like

him. But Madani soon perceived Jinnah's continued support of princes and big landlords coupled with his failure to consult with the 'ulama, as a betrayal. Instead of Muslim League and the Indian National Congress coming closer, they increasingly diverged. Not only did the claim of the League to be the only representative of Muslims intensify, but also increasingly articulated demands for Muslim geographic autonomy. In contrast, Madani ever more clearly formulated his arguments for Muslim and non-Muslim politicians to work together under the aegis of the Indian National congress. Madani was absolutely clear that his vision of a religiously plural society not only strategically best served Muslim interests, but that it also had clear Koranic sanction.[11]

In December 1937, at a political meeting in Delhi, Maulana Madani made a straightforward statement, 'In the current age, *qaumeen (*nations) are based on *autaan (plural of watan)* (homelands), not religion'. What made this point obvious to him was that people abroad made no distinction of whether a person was 'Muslim, Hindu, Sikh or Parsi'- all were viewed as 'Hindustani'. He reiterated as he often had before, all Indians were viewed with contempt because of being in bondage to colonial rule. The following day Urdu newspapers *al-Aman* and *Ehsaan* (soon followed by others) had reported that Madani had said that not 'nation', but *millat* (a term commonly in fact linked to religious community) depended on territory.

Madani had not said that, but the report provided Iqbal an opportunity to insist that Muslims needed a political unit or units of their own.[12] Iqbal dismissed the distinction between *millat* and *qaum* as a philological quibble, irrelevant to his fundamental concern, namely, his denunciation of the modern, territorially based nationalism modeled by Europe that he believed was destructive of ideal human relationships as symbolized by Islam. In poetry and prose, he had for decades, in company with a minor strand of other Indian intellectuals as well as with European and non-European critics across the globe, denounced the 'black' side of modernity: competitive nationalism and its resultant militarism, imperialism and consumerism. As Iqbal wrote in his response to Maulana Madani, 'I have been repudiating the concept of Nationalism since the time when it was not well-known in India and the Muslim world'. Just as Madani saw the hand of imperialism in tearing apart plural societies on religious grounds (as Muslims and Christians) in the Ottoman Empire, Iqbal emphasized the same intervention as sowing the seeds of national boundaries between Arabs and Turks who should have realized their common bonds as Muslims.

Iqbal had, he said, no quarrel with simple patriotism: '….the Maulana's statement that nations are formed by lands is not open to objections. It was when that simple love of native land became a 'political concept' or 'social order' that he objected in favour of an order based on

Islam. Nationalism, Iqbal believed, inevitably led to indifference towards religion, as had happened in Europe. The Maulana might claim that *millat* had a higher place than religious community, as he had done in his response, but his approach, according to Iqbal, would lead to religion as 'merely private affair. Iqbal insisted that he was correct reading of the Koran, whose only call was to the *millat* or *ummat* of Islam. Iqbal accepted the point made by Madani that a *qaum* could include believers and non-believers, but only to insist on the higher prophetic goal of creating the *umma* of believers that transcended the destructive divisions of nation and race. The Prophet rejected those of his own lineage-like Abu Lahab-who denied Islam. The Prophet in short was not an Arab patriot but a leader of co-religionists.

In concluding his statement, far from glossing over the differences between them, Iqbal went beyond the insult of his original verse. He went so far as to identify the ideas of 'Maulana Husain Ahmad and others who think like him' as being as egregiously deviant as those of the modern sect, the Ahmadiyya (or as he called them 'Qadiani'). The Ahmadis were alleged to deny the fundamental Islamic tenet of the finality of Prophet Mohammad. The idea of nationalism might be political, Iqbal wrote, and the idea of prophethood theological, but both, he arged '[took] up a position in addition to what the divine law [had] prescribed and defined for them all time to come'. For Madani, an active voice in virulent opposition to the Ahmadis,

this was a low blow indeed. Between the poet and the Maulana there was indeed a gulf.[13]

Iqbal and Madani did not differ over the basis of nationalism, the one insisting on religion, the other on territory, as it might seem. The real point was that Iqbal, unrealistically, struggled to imagine a world in the twentieth century with no nationalism at all. He thought that Muslim political autonomy would foster in one place a less divided and less exploitative society on the basis of an Islamic moral system that would in fact serve all people, Muslim or non-Muslim. Nor did they share a view of Islam. 'Islam' then as now meant various things to different people. Medernist to the core, for Iqbal, Islam was a great philosophical system, nothing less than the very source of modernity. This was an issue of no interest whatsoever to Madani. Iqbal imagined a genealogy of rationalism that produced modern science, and in that genealogy Muslims had played a substantial role, not merely as transmitters of the classical heritage to Europe but as active participants and shapers of that heritage. Indeed in one of the striking passages of the celebrated series of lectures he delivered in 1928, he turned to the Prophet of Islam who, he maintained, 'in so far as the spirit of his revelation is concerned… belongs to the modern world… The birth of Islam … is the birth of inductive intellect'. In his vision, moreover, the rational, ethical system of Islam was to be understood precisely by individuals like himself, without

‘priesthood and hereditary kinship’, given ‘the constant appeal to reason and experience in the Koran, and the emphasis that it [laid] on Nature and History as sources of human knowledge’. In a place rid of colonialism as well as of nationalist and other divisions, the spirit of Islam would allow a society of creative individuals to flourish again.

It is worth underlining what was not his stance in relation to Islam. It was not the ‘Islamist’ vision emerging in these decades, associated above all with Maududi that made Islam an alternate to totalizing systems like fascism and communism. Nor was it concerned with disseminating fidelity to the ritual and social practices of Islamic law, the concern of reformist ‘ulama like Madani. His lack of concern for ‘Islamic law’ or an ‘Islamic system’, was evident in his 1930 presidential address to the Muslim League: “**Nor should the Hindus fear that the creation of autonomous Muslim states will mean the introduction of a kind of religious rule in such states… It is a state conceived as a contractual organism long before Rousseau ever though to such a thing… The character of a Muslim state can be judged from what the *Times of India* pointed out some time ago in a leader on the Indian Banking Enquiry Committee. ‘In ancient India’, the paper points out, ‘the state framed laws regulating the rates of interest, but in Muslim times, although Islam clearly forbids the realization of interest on money loaned, Indian Muslim states**

imposed no restriction on such notes”. This speech is better known for being the first influential call for autonomy, in this case within India, of areas of Muslim concentration like Punjab and the north-west where he hoped his Islamic vision could flourish. That the seed he watered with these remarks would grow into the virulently nationalist state of Pakistan is surely one of the great ironies of twentieth century history.[14]

In turning to Madani’s goal of an independent India, which was the core of thinking was his emphasis on communities relatively encapsulated in their individual languages, cultures, and education and moral/legal systems. It is in this sense that Madani’s conviction about the importance of language, noted earlier, has importance. The commitments he details from the Indian National Congress, reiterated below, served, he believed to secure these rights. Historian Peter Hardy has spoken of this vision as a kind of ‘judicial’ or we could even say cultural, ‘apartheid’. He imagined Muslims as a ‘community’, guided by religious leadership, following distinctive educational, cultural, and legal paths from other religiously defined communities. What was left for common efforts, Madani argued, were effectively those now delegated to a range of public forums and assemblies. The risk to Islam he feared was not from interacting with Hindus but from the British given their policies and their style of English education.

It was with a hard-headed appraisal of the destructiveness of British rule and the need to overthrow it that Madani ended his pamphlet.

Madani was a hard-headed pragmatist. He recognized that nationalism, democracy and the importance of public opinion were the political currency of the day. He welcomed that form of government as a context in which an ‘ulama like him could guide Muslims in all those practices of faith and work that made up the texture of an observant religious life. His was not the ‘spirit’ of philosophical, ethical Islam of Iqbal, but the concrete Islam of individual ritual and behavioural guidance. He shared the pattern of ‘traditionalist’ Islamic leaders elsewhere as well who welcome a secular state that gives them scope to further that guidance. Madani could not imagine severing his ties with the plural society he lived in and the land where his ancestors were buried. He could not imagine a state led by irreligious people like Jinnah or who seemed oblivious of the astonishing diversity of Muslim sectarian orientations and of a political culture predicated on persuasion, not force.[15]

In his reply Madani said that, as Allama Iqbal learnt from his replies to some of his friends’ letters, he had no intention of advising any one on Nationalism and he had used no such words in the statement he had issued in Delhi. He was simply talking about the great loss and sufferings that the British government has inflicted upon all Indians, especially Muslims. He

also mentioned the fact that in their times the country makes a nation. And that all Indians, whether they are Hindu, Muslim, Sikh or Zoroastrian, are looked down upon everywhere abroad. Since they all belong to this country, they are regarded as one *qaum*. Our prestige and honour is no better than that of slaves: we are treated shabbily and our legitimate demands are ignored. Indians are not only discriminated against abroad regarding our citizenship rights, but are also discriminated against vis-à-vis our human rights. All our protests fall on def ears. This was, in his view, an effect of slavery. How the cronies of the British government would have digested such remarks! They blew them out of proportion and made a mountain out of a molehill. However, there may be some hidden virtues behind this euphoria. If seen from this perspective, the discussion is over. Seen from another angle, he deemed it necessary to say something because, according to Allama Iqbal, any counsel of composite nationalism to Indian Muslims is unethical and un-Islamic-which in his view is not correct. During the course of his explanation, he had discussed some other aspects related to the issue which he had pointed out briefly in his previous statement. .[16]

According to Maulana, this amazing passage (of Allama Iqbal) also vindicates my assertions that the word *qaum* in the holy Koran calls for national unity between believers and non-believers alike. I have been arguing it. That the term comes from the holy Koran is now accepted. To argue that

infidels, too, can have their religion and nation is not surprising. I have already quoted the passage from the *Majma-ul Bahar* that says, ‘The word became popular and then it was used in the meaning of false religion.’ The lines that I have quoted from *Tajul Uroos* and *Sharh-e-Qamus* further clarify my views on *Muttahida Qaumiyat*. However, there still remains a vast different between the words-*millat* and *qaum. Millat* means religion or sharia, or the way of life whether it is true or false. *Qaum* refers to men (exclusively) or a group of men and women whether they are believers or non-believers, or else provided there is a meeting point between them.[17]

Madani observed the British Aversions and he told when the fabric of Muslim unity in Asia, Europe and Africa has been shredded to pieces, we are told that Islam preached only Muslim unity, and that it can neither unite with non-Muslims nor can it forge composite nationalism on them. If a Muslim joins a non-Muslim on the basis of nationalism or race or profession and forges a sort of unity, he is branded as an enemy of Islamic teachings, ‘nationalism’, ‘secularism’, etc., which Islam does not permit and which are the negation of the Koranic teachings. The same story was repeated in the case of handicrafts and commerce which were once thriving and Indian products were dominating the markets in England and in other European countries. At the same time the philosophy of ‘safe and secure trade’ was propagated by Europeans and every newspaper, journal and

intellectual's lecture sang paeans of its virtues as if it was a source of eternal bliss for mankind. However, when the Indian economy and commerce were weakened by this policy and 'made in England' goods began to dominate the market, the philosophy of 'free trade' was preached to us. We were told that the philosophy of 'safe and secure trade' had proven wrong.

How dangerous the formation of any outfit based on the principles of composite nationalism was for the British can be gauged from the statement of Professor Selley. In his article the professor opined that *"if this spirit was infused in the hearts of Indian people, though it may not be strong to overthrow the mighty British, it would be enough to enliven the spirit that any cooperation with a foreign power would be a shameful act. This would eventually lend to the downfall of British rule*. Thus, the nationalism that the West did not tire of praising remained endearing and praiseworthy so long as Islam and the rule of Islamic Caliphate were dominant. After the defeat of Muslim power, however, the same nationalism became despicable. Indeed, this is strange![18]

Maulana put the ideas before Muslims that Europe used nationalism as an effective weapon to destroy the Ottoman Empire; Muslims too, should have used it to undermine the power of the British. It would have been a case of using the same weapon to destroy the enemy that the enemy had used against Muslims. Indian Muslims should have adopted it to seek

revenge on their enemy. However, this did not happen. Knowingly or unknowingly, the philosophy is being taught to Indian Muslims that nationalism is to be hated. The establishment of any unity based on composite nationalism with non-Muslims is religiously impermissible as well as harmful for the Islamic cause. The Muslim community was a miniscule minority but did not get absorbed in the mainstream for centuries. Today, when their population had crossed 80 million, it is argued that they would become a morsel for the Hindus.[19]

Maulana hold the idea that, Prophet of Islam Hazrat Mohammad created a bond among Muslims that is superior to all bonds. In comparison, bonds such as nationalism are pale and colourless. A Muslim, whoever and wherever he is, is the brother of another Muslim and he has right over other Muslims. This bond of *rabita* (relationships) exists only among those who have accepted Islam. In the case of those who have not embraced Islam, this bond cannot be established. They could be part of composite nationalism, but only through the bonds of *nasal* (race), *rang* (colour) and nationality.

It is quite apparent that waiting for all Indians to become Muslims in order to enter into such an alliance is wrong and harmful. There is no doubt that Islam combines principles of both ideological and practical reformation. Moreover, it does not only strive for the reformation of an

individual, but also strives to reform society as a whole-irrespective of privileged or under-privileged. Islam focuses on problems universally and permits all sorts of reforms. But the point is whether Islam (the Islamic principles that deal with individual as well as community life and pertain to such issues as God, relationship of God with His creatures and relationship between His creatures) permits that together with non-Muslims, a United Front can be formed on the basis of *wataniyat, nasal, rang* or *zabaan* (language), etc., to defeat the enemies.[20]

From what has been described above, it becomes apparent that for Muslims to become a nation or to form a nation with non-Muslims is neither undue interference in religious affairs nor it is against the spirit of common welfare that Islamic law envisages. A Muslim while observing his religion can join hands with non-Muslims and can become a nation as they have lived earlier. Islam is a flexible religion-especially at a time when it is a war and there is need to acquire more power and strength to defeat the enemy.[21]

By composite nationalism Maulana means here ‘nationalism’, the foundation of which was laid down by Prophet Mohammad in Madina. That is to say, the people of India as Indians, as a nation united (despite religious and cultural diversity), should become one solid nation and should wage war against the alien power that has usurped their natural rights. It is

incumbent upon every Indian to fight against such a barbaric regime and throw off the shackles of slavery. It is important not to interfere in another's religion-rather all nations (communities) living in India are free to practice their religion, live by its moral values and act according to their religious traditions. While maintaining peace and tranquility, they should propagate their ideology, follow their culture, promote civilization and protect their personal law. Neither should a minority interfere in the personal affairs of other minorities or the majority, nor should the majority strive to assimilate the minority into itself.

This is what the Indian National Congress has been striving to achieve ever since its inception. In its first session in 1885, it outlined its main objectives in the following words: 'To unite the divergent and conflicting elements-that form the Indian populace-and turn them into one nation.

However, even after this (somewhat ambiguous) declaration, it has always stated that all citizens shall be free to pursue their religion, culture, personal law, etc. The proposal discussed at the meeting of the All India Congress Committee meeting on 8 August 1931, described the fundamental rights and duties of the citizens and JUH extent its full support to its objectives. Any constitutional provisions or declaration that the Indian

National Congress would make or through it the Independent Government shall make, it essentially shall have the following points:

(1) Every Indian citizen shall have the following rights, i.e. freedom of speech and expression, total freedom of coordinated action and collaboration and right to peaceful, without arms, assembly for any purpose that is neither immoral nor against the law.

(2) Every Indian citizen shall have the freedom of conscience and right to declare, follow and propagate his religion-provided it does not degenerate and causes public disorder.

(3) All religious minorities shall have the constitutional right to protection of their cultures, languages and their religious rituals. Besides, the areas inhabited by linguistic minorities shall have adequate safeguard to their languages.

The Working Committee meeting of the Indian National Congress, held in Calcutta on 26 October 1937, reinforced and elaborated the same objectives.[22]

The Indian National Congress has always said that it considers its duty to protect minorities, safeguard their cultural, political and economic rights and provide full opportunity for the growth in these fields. The main objective of the Indian National Congress and JUH is to liberate India and

create unity among peoples of all faiths whereby the entire nation would work for the progress of India, without harming others for its partisan end. From liberation and cooperation it should not be construed that from among different cultures and civilizations a particular culture shall be singled out and subjected to pressures-rather it will be protected so that all the communities feel free to follow their traditions and progress without any hindrance. Since there have been efforts to create confusion among people towards the policy of the Congress, the All India Congress Committee once again would like to reaffirm and declare its policy. As for the rights of minorities, the following principles are put forth:

(1) Every citizen of India shall be free to express his opinion, form a society and organization and shall have the right to peaceful, without arms, assembly for any such purpose that is neither immoral nor against the law.

(2) Every citizen shall be free to profess his religious views and also shall be free to join any religious group-provided it does not degenerate and ause public disorder.

(3) Language, culture and script and all religious and linguistic minorities residing in different provinces shall be protected.

(4) Irrespective of religion, caste and gender, all shall be equal before the law.

(5) There shall be no differentiation on the basis of religion, caste and gender in employment for any ordinary government post or that of responsibility and dignity.

(6) All citizens shall have equal rights and duties in using public facilities such as roads, schools, ponds and other facilities built by government funds for the welfare of the general public.

(7) The government shall maintain neutrality and impartiality in discharging its duties.

The above articles concerning the basic rights of minorities make it abundantly clear that there shall be no interference in the religious and cultural affairs of minorities, and they will retain their 'personal law' given to them in the Constitution. The majority cannot and shall not pressurize the minority for any changes in their personal law.

Later, the Congress party in its General Body meeting held at Haripura, Surat district on 19-21 February 1938, declared the same in the following words and approved all previous resolutions passed by the All India Congress Committee.

“The Indian National Congress welcomes the sentiments and spirit of Muslims and other minorities in the fight against the colonial and imperialist power. It also welcomes united participation of all sections and communities in India’s freedom struggle that is same for one and all. The Congress specially welcomes the large number of the minority community (Muslims) who have joined the Indian National Congress and strengthened its hand in the liberation struggle against the oppressive foreign power.

According to Maulana, the declarations of the Indian National Congress make it abundantly clear that it was in favour of the formation of composite nationalism in India and was opposed to undue interference in the religious, cultural, linguistic and personal affairs of Indian citizens. It was only concerned with issues of common needs and interests that had been usurped by all alien government and used to destroy the interests of the common people.

These affairs more or less similar to those required for participation in public forums like town area, notified area, municipal boards, district boards, councils and assemblies. This is not implemented with a view to absorb a nation or a religion into another nation and religion. Though the rules and regulations of these institutions vary, there is neither salvation in it for Indian citizens nor can participation in it be equated with atheism, irreligiousness, disbelief and assimilation in another religion. It is also

possible to refrain from participating in these institutions because of such fears.[23]

According to Madani everyone is aware of that Europe has enacted certain collective laws for business and industrial establishments and companies, many clauses of which are in total in contravention to the principles of Islamic law. Here Maulana raised the question that, Should a *fatwa* be issued that to set up business establishments, companies or industries, and many such associations for the armed forces and the agricultural sector is illegal?

It must be accepted that forming associations is not only essential, but is also right. However, it is important to eschew those things that are in contravention to Islamic teachings. The same principle has to be followed while forming any national or political association. If any board-whether it is the Bar Association or the Educational Association-adopts a clause that is against Islam, it is the moral duty of Muslims to oppose and struggle against it.[24]

Madani deeply discussed the interaction of the Islamic System with Other Systems. He holds the idea that the assumption that Islam and its adherents cannot confederate and interact with any other system is unacceptable. Although Islamic jurisprudence and *sharia* contains written

views on several matters, there remain uncountable things that are allowed, and in which each person is free to act upon as per his expediency. Among these are kingdoms, their ordinances and organizations, etc., that are used as ways and means of expediency. If certain resolutions are mooted by an agricultural or a commercial or an industrial establishment and practical action is taken to implement them, being Islamic, or participation would not be illegal from any point of view. There are many collective ordinances in the *sharia* that are based on Islamic rule. These do not address the individual, but Caliphs and Sultans. When there is no Islamic government, it is neither obligatory nor permissible that an individual or a unit or Muslims act upon it. In such a situation the duty of the unit shall be only that as per its capabilities it should strive to establish an Islamic government. Penal ordinances and capital punishments fall under this category. Before this, it would be permissible and desirable that Muslims take action and try to implement those ordinances that are closer to the national interest and beneficial to the community. Thus, how can it be expedient and correct to pronounces illegal the unity and cooperation with other (non-Islamic) collective bodies on the basis of the collective laws of Islam?[25]

Maulana was also the champion of individualism. According to him it is possible for an individual and a Nation to have different identies. An individual can at the same time a member of different organizations, the

duties and responsibilities of which may vary in accordance with his assignments and posts. For example, an individual can be a son, a father, a son-in-law, a father-in-law, a disciple, a mentor and a ruler, and can discharge the duties of each role accordingly. He can also be a member of different parties and organizations at the same time, and strictly follow their rules and regulations. It is equally possible that an individual is a member of the bar association, of the municipal board, assembly or parliament and at the same time be a member of a trade union, an education board, and fruitfully discharge all his duties. Similarly, it is possible that a person is attached to one or more non-Muslim organizations on the basis of kinship or profession or nation, and shares composite nationalism with them and at the same time he champions the unity of Muslim *ummah* all over the world. And thus, as per his agreement with those organizations and as per the teachings of the religion, discharges his assigned duties. A verse of the holy Koran reads: "***… but if they seek help from you in the matter of religion then it is your duty to help (them) except against a folk between whom and you there is a treaty….'(9.72)*** This Koranic verse makes it amply clear that a Muslim being part of the *ummah* can also maintain a relationship with non-Muslims. While assisting and cooperating with his Muslim brothers, he can abide by the clauses of the agreement that he has entered into with non-Muslims. In the event that a clause of the agreement that a Muslim has entered into with non-Muslims goes against the interest of the Muslim *ummah*, he would perforce

abide by the clause of the agreement and withdraw all assistance and cooperation to Muslims.

While living in India and forming a *qaum* with other communities in the country, Muslims can retain their Muslimness and can also protect their rights, distinct culture, language, religion and personal law, and can also think and act for their protection. While discharging their national duty, they can maintain their relationship with the Muslim *ummah* whether they live in Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Hejaz, Yemen, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Asia Minor, West Asia, Africa, Europe and America, etc. there is no inherent contradiction between the two. This neither affects the universal Islamic affinity of Indian Muslims nor there a clash with the universal Islami affinity of Muslims living in other countries.[26]

There are two sets of issues before us. The first one is personal and eternal in nature, while the second one is temporal and special. The first one is related to the salvation of the populace from the eternal wrath of the Creator, the removal of dirt from spiritual life, achievement of real progress in both the worlds and the attainment of eternal happiness. This is the goal of Islam and its founder. To achieve this goal, the universal law of Islam has always been and should be invoked. Even the slightest laxity would not only harm Muslims, but would also prove harmful for the entire humanity.

The second issue is India and the deliverance of its citizens from the problems faced by them. This issue is temporary and special. This problem will continue to be devil India till the light of the true religion dispels its darkness. However, as I have said earlier, foreign occupation and the selfish rule of the brute (British) nation has pushed Indians-especially Muslims-to the verge of destruction. As W.S. Blunt said: *I have been studying the mysteries of Indian finance under 'the best masters', Government Secretaries, Commissioners, and the rest, and have come to the conclusion that if we go on 'developing' the country at its present rate, the inhabitants will have, sooner or later, to resort to cannibalism, for there will be nothing but each other left them to eat.*[27]

Indian soldiers, Indian wealth, Indian arms and Indian knowledge and expertise are being used as means to harm the other *qaum*. Peter Freeman, a member of the House of Commons and President of the Common Wealth of India League, once said: 'At times it has been said that if India gains home rule, a terrible fate would overwhelm the common masses. It however won't be a catastrophe bigger than a hundred years of the British rule that befell on them.[28]

Sir John Shower wrote in 1833, 'Excessively ruinous and destructive policies of the British rule made India and its inhabitants so poor that one finds difficulty in getting precedence.'

Expressing similar sentiments, Sir William Digby wrote in 1901: "*Hard as the saying may sound in the ears of the ordinary Englishman; the plunder is preceding far more outrageously to-day than at any preceding period. The thin whips of the early days of our rule have become bundles of wire thongs; the exactions of Clive and Hastings fall into insignificance by the side of the drain which, in ever-augmenting volume, is over-enriching one country at the cost of the life-blood of another.* Volumes written by none other than the British themselves speak of the hardships and trauma that Indians suffered during the crues and oppressive British regime. Muslims have been the worst victims of its oppression. Therefore, it is the duty of every Indian citizen to strive to overthrow this oppressive regime. It is necessary to use the lesser evil, which Muslims are ordered and authorized to use by the *sharia*. To fulfil the obligation of *jihad* and execute it, there is no condition of special arms and special method. All those strategies and all weapons that could destroy the enemy, weaken its hold on power and diminish its pomp and grandeur are permissible. It is this meaning that is conveyed through words like *swatantrata* (freedom) and *swaraj* (self rule).[29]

All his analyses and intelligence prove that composite nationalism is the most effective weapon of Indians against foreign rule. This would harm the British political lords more than anything else. With the passage of time, this has begun to increasingly offend them and had

compelled them to devise a poisonous prescription called Divide and Rule to counteract this danger. Since the beginning Indians were lured into consuming this fatal poison in sugarcoated pills and even today, this poison is being injected into the body politic of India. It was this that strengthened the British rule in India and it cannot be said when this hegemony will come to an end.

British thinkers have propounded many enchanting theories, produced an abundance of literature, distributed countless handbills and organized numerous lectures to misguide simple and clean-hearted Indians. This was a ruse and a stratagem to cripple Indian minds, especially Muslim minds. Something that was described as beneficial for Europe was projected as poisonous for Muslims. Aversion to composite nationalism was instilled in the hearts and minds of Muslims.[30]

Maulana gives the special references of Sir Sayyed Ahmed Khan, an intelligent, brave and politically conscious man, who had not only proved his courage and love for the nation by writing books such as *Asba'b-i-Baghawat-i-Hind* (The Causes for Indian Revolt), but also had the courage to say the following about composite nationalism: *"the word qaum applies to people living in one country. Remember that Hindu and Muslim are words of religious significance; otherwise Hindus, Muslims and Christians who live in this country are one qaum. When these groups are called on qaum, their*

country of dwelling being one, their national interest should be one as well. Days are gone when inhabitants of the same country will be regarded two distinct aqwan (nations) on the basis of religion.

On another occasion Sir Syed had said, 'Like Aryans who are called Hindu, Muslims, too, are called Hindu-that means inhabitants of India.

He remarked on another occasion, 'The word Hindu that you have used for yourself (as a religious community) is not right, in my opinion. In my view, Hindu is not the name of any religion. Every one living in India can call himself a Hindu. However, it is quite strange and sad as well that though we (Muslims) live in India, you (Hindus) do not consider us Hindu.

Talking on the issue of Hindu-Muslim unity, Sir Syed said: *"I have repeatedly said that India is like a beautiful bride and Hindus and Muslims are her two beautiful eyes. The beauty lies in safety and equality of both of her eyes. If one of them loses uniformity, the beautiful bride would become ugly. And if one is lost, the same beautiful bride would turn blemished, one-eyed.* Later Sir Syed was so mesmerized and influenced by the enchantment of British magicians like Mr. Beck, Mr. Morrison and Mr. Archapold that he not only ceased to draw people's attention to composite nationalism, but also generated hatred in Muslim minds against it and opposed the Indian National Congress and its policies. He was the front-

runner among those who provided support to the British government and also considered it the nectar of immortality for Indian Muslims.

Thus, the magicians of Britain entrapped a politically conscious and wise man (of Sir Syed's stature) and not only used him to oppose composite nationalism, but also to prevent Muslims from participating in politics and constitutional struggle in order to alienate them from politics forever. It would not be surprising if the same enchanting spell is cast on Mohammad Iqbal too.

The interests of colonialist Britain are known to us; the deceptive moves of their hired men, the wonders and trickery of their propaganda and propaganda machinery are also known to us. Even the mighty kingdoms of Europe have often been entrapped by the strange magic of this imperialist power called Britain. They have openly expressed and accepted this fact. Thus, they have not only befooled ordinary people on this planet, but have also cheated great kings and nobles.

Maulana said that, it is religiously, sensibly, humanely and politically incumbent upon Indian Muslims to actively participate in both promotion of faith and composite nationalism. Participation in one does not preclude the other. To prevent Muslims from being a part of composite nationalism on religious grounds would tantamount to non-participation of

Muslims in the struggle for overthrowing British rule. At a time when Muslims are in a minority, this would not only cripple them, but would also lead them to their graves.

The British government is making all-out efforts to prevent Indian Muslims from entering the political field. They do not want Muslims to participate in composite nationalism and become a united force in launching the freedom struggle that may prove a catalyst in overthrowing the British government. Those who are trying to prevent Muslim participation in politics and are trying to plaint a hateful picture of composite nationalism, are undoubtedly doing a great service to the British government, which their own army and arsenals have failed to achieve.[31]

Muslims in Hyderabad were facing more difficult situation than those of any other part of India because under Nizam's rule they had kept severely away from the main current of politics in the rest of the country. Besides, whereas most other princely states within the geographical boundaries of Indian Union had opted to merge with the new state, the Nizam had stubbornly refused to fall in line with others and, wrongly advised by foolishly over-ambitious ministers, tried to join hands with Pakistan. As a result it had to face Indian military under Police Action and the common Muslims had to face the wrath of the army as well as the people who had been struggling against the autocratic rule that was the norm in most of the

princely states. In this backdrop was held the 17th session of Jamiat. Maulana in his presidential address brought to them the messages of hope and confidence and advised them to confidently face the future.

The address is distinguished by his observations about India-Pakistan relations, an issue that had assumed special importance in the background of recent happenings: “Even as India has an important place in world politics, Pakistan also has been acknowledged as a permanent unit of international politics. It is no use now to scratch the old wounds. The good of the entire country, nay, of the whole of Asia, demands that the relations between the two countries should be friendly, the two should have mutual trust and all the differences should be resolved peacefully. The common people on both sides should come close and develop maximum possible trade and economic relations. Traffic to and fro should be free and open and songs of love and friendship should reverberate in the atmosphere, old bitterness forgotten as a bad old dream.

Referring to the difficulties faced by Hyderabad Muslims he advised them not to be disheartened and have faith in the message of their Prophet that God Almighty would certainly provide them succour if their objective is righteous and helpful to mankind. “The primary duty of a Muslim” he said, “is to discover his individual and group objective and always act keeping that in view. The objective has been determined by the

holy Qur'an that 'You are the best community created to benefit mankind. You always teach good deeds and check evil'." (Several traditions of the Prophet are cited in support of the contention.)

He went on: "*The spirit of humanity and Islam consists in returning good for evil, kindness for excess and forgiveness for oppression and tyranny. The Prophet has said, 'If somebody severs relations with you, you forgive him; if somebody does wrong to you, you be good to him'.*

In adverse circumstances do keep your faith strong and observe patience and perseverance. Of course, keep in mind that patience, self-discipline and morally upright conduct is now cowardice, fear or weakness. It only means moral and courteous behaviour even when there is an opportunity to wreak revenge.[32]

Thereafter he explained the significance of the secular democratic character of the Constitution adopted by free India: "*it is a matter of satisfaction that the Congress remained true to its principles and ideology. That is why the constitution of the country has been based on the values of secularism and democracy. This constitution gives equal rights to every citizen of India and opens the doors for progress without any distinction or discrimination on the basis of religion. It provides opportunity to each section to think of ways for its development and act accordingly. But, we are*

simultaneously expected to do our duty which this constitution brings upon us. It is the duty of Muslims to think how their religion, religious sciences, Islamic culture, their glorious traditions and places of pilgrimage can be protected and preserved while participating actively in the work of national reconstruction. Emphasising the need for special attention to religious education he pointed out that *we have welcomed the secular state but it would be wrong to expect that it can provide religious education to all communities; we should therefore bear this responsibility ourselves, especially because Islam enjoins upon every Muslim to look after religious education.* In this context the various trust properties have added significance because the success of a state lies in the freedom that every religious community enjoys in matters of religion. Regarding *awkaf* he pointed out: *Though republican India has given the same importance to awkaf that has been accorded to personal law but the danger lies in that the approach of provincial governments is not the same everywhere. It is therefore essential that the basic clauses of the Muslim Wakf Act are the same every where, the income of the awkaf should be confined to religious and Islamic functions and there should be no interference of the government.*

Turning to the problem of text books and history writing he said they are carrying the same prejudices that had been introduced by Sir Henry Elliot and Mr. Kais: "*To call their writings history is tantamount to*

ridicule history. The facts of history should be properly researched and put together honestly and faithfully. For promotion of knowledge among Muslims he emphasized the importance of learning Hindi that had been declared the national language. But to preserve Urdu they must put in some extra effort and make necessary sacrifice for starting libraries and other such institutions for promotion of Urdu.

It has been noted about how the Custodian department was acting in a viciously anti-Muslim communal spirit. Maulana told the audience how the Jamiat was struggling against its excesses and that the authorities in Central government were sympathetic to their efforts. Summing upt his message he said: "*Religion and the community should be safeguarded with patience, perseverance and sincerity and there should be no let up in doing the duty for the progress and dignity of the country. Values of national unity, integration and tolerance should always be the guiding spirit.*

I do not ask you to support any particular political party except that while choosing a partykeep these values in mind and join the party which you think is the best in their light. Your only assets in life are courage, determination and untiring capacity for struggle.[33]

Through the activities of JUH we also come to know about the political ideas of Maulana. Jamiat decided to hold the session in Caclutta so

that proper attention could be paid to the problems of Bengali Muslims. As was his won't Maulana's presidential address there provided them a sense of confidence as well as balanced advice for facing the situation.

At the outset he explained to them the nature of "what had happened in 1947" he said, "was a revolution of a different nature in the sense that the armed forces and government circles that are the usual targets of a revolution remained safe and only the common people had to suffer losses in life and property though their only relation with the change, if any, was remote and indirect. The loss of life, property and honour they faces is a horrible tragedy in the history of mankind. The Muslims could not be an exception to this destruction; their community life was hit and shattered into pieces.

He then pointed out how Jamiat had faced the situation and hoped that despite the horrible nature of those days their effects would pass even as that situation did not last. The task for future is to maintain in tact the tenets and tradition of Islam for the coming generations. A secular country provides primary education to every child but we should understand that secular education cannot be the substitute for religious and spiritual education. In this context he informed the audience about the *Deeni Talimi Convention* organised by Jamiat in Bombay just prior to the Calcutta session

where a Deeni Talimi Board was set up. Maulana asked people to support its activities.

According to him education and training of the family is the personal responsibility of each individual. As such every home has to become a school but if that is not possible every mosque should serve the purpose. A network of such schools or seminaries should be spread all over the country.

In these institutions the training should be comprehensive in nature so that each child learns how to conduct himself in society and become serviceable to people at large. "We should widen the scope of religious education so that the respect that a Muslim commands may not be confined to the four walls of the mosque but may pervade the whole society".

He recommended proper training of teachers who should fully understand their responsibility; the teachers should be given their due respect. Fulfillment of this task is necessary to check the decline and degeneration that has set in the Muslim society.

He wanted people to develop in themselves the Islamic virtues of public service, freedom of opinion, brotherhood, equality and compassion because then they would be able to infuse these virtues in democracy which is degenerating into merely counting of votes. The Muslims, he said, should

not wait for others to take initiative because spreading these virtues in human society have been enjoined upon Muslims as duty.

Coming to concrete issues that need to be addressed he mentioned the need for changing the textbooks that fostered communal prejudices. So far as improvement of economic conditions is concerned again the Muslims should not make demands on others but develop qualifications that compel others to recognize their value.

Concluding his address he expressed sympathy for those families that had suffered during the 1950 riots. It is a matter of shame for any administration that such a large number of people in the country should remain homeless. It is good to look after the suffering refugees from East but it should not be at the cost of country's own citizens.[34]

The 19th session of Jamiat, the last one that he addressed, was held at the South Gujarat city of Surat from October 17 to 19 of 1956. The address there started with emphasis on simple living and high thinking, on matching deeds with words. "Pomp and show, display of power and wealth is not the sign of a living community. Islam demands deeds to match your verbal claims." He said and pointed out "*whether we shall live in this country with respect and dignity depends upon our thinking and enlightened*

conduct" as, according to divine law, one gets only that for which one strives.

However he wanted the law-makers to pass laws to curb communalism and religious fanaticism. The Muslims, on the other hand, should produce such literature in different languages that brings the message of welfare and good of entire humanity. The Prophet had addressed himself to entire mankind not to Muslims alone.

He stressed the need for reforming textbooks by including in them the description of the cultures and living conduct of all religions and not of one community or sect alone as was the case with existing textbooks.

Coming to the woes of the community about the discrimination in economic affairs and in matters of employment, he said: "*I do not favour method of agitation. Nor can agitation be fruitful in the prevailing circumstances. Only positive efforts can bring success."* Pointing out that Muslims held a dominant position in handicrafts and cottage industries, he said: "*if they participate in development plans sincerely and with courage they can not only heal their own wounds but also become proud sharers in the progress of the nation."* Finally, he insisted upon participation in the electoral process: *"In the independent republic of India election is the final word of government formation. Muslims have made a significant contribution*

to the making of this decision. It is the obligation of Muslims to realize their own importance and give evidence of being enlightened, patriotic and alive to the national good.

In this respect it is the duty of the government and of all nationalist parties to show consideration for the importance of every minority.[35]

His sacrifice for the plight of Indians is still attested to by one and all. His Political ideas, lectures, written works and his speeches are a living testimony to his radiant being. May Almighty bless him and illumine his grave.

REFERENCES:

1. Abul Hasan Bara Bankvi, *Malfuzaat Hazrat Madani*, (2003), P-9, Published by Darul Ishaat, Deoband, (U.P.)

2. Tara Chand, History of the freedom movement in India Vol.II (1972), P.258, Published by the Director, Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, Patiala house, New Delhi-1.

3. *Chirag-e-Mohammed*, A biography of Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani, (1998), PP.176-177, Written by Qazi Mohd. Zahed-ul-Husaini Published by Al-Jamiat Book Depot, New Delhi.110006.

4. D.R. Goyal, A biography of Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani (2004), PP.94-95, Published by Anamika Publishers and distributors, New Delhi-110002.

5. Op.Cit. D.R. Goyal (PP.95-96) See also Ulema-e-Haq. (Vol.II).

6. Op.cit. *Chirag-e-Mohd*. PP.105-106.

7. Dr. Rasheedul Wahidi (Ed.) *Hayat-Voh-Karname, Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani*, PP.236-238, Aljamiat Book Depot, New Delhi.

8. Op.cit. D.R. Goyal. P.100.

9. Ibid P-101.

10. Op.cit. Dr. Rasheedul Wahidi (Ed) PP.44-47.

11. Mohd. Salman Mansoorpuri (Ed.), *Tahreek-e-Azadi Hindi Mein Muslim Ulema Aur Awaam Ka Kirdaar*, (2000), PP.100-101, Published by Zam Zam Book Depot, Deoband.

12. Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani, *Muttahida Qaumiyat Aur Islam* (2002), P-6, Published by Al-Jamiat Book Depot, New Delhi.

13. Dr. Syed Abed Husain, *Hindustani Musalmaan Aaina-e-Aiyyammein* (1991), PP.116-119, Published by Dr. Syed Abid Husain Memorial Trust, New Delhi-25.

14. Composite Nationalism and Islam (Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani,(2005) Introduced by Barbara D. Metcalf, PP.43-47, Published by Manohar Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi.

15. Ibid. PP. 46-51.

16. Op.cit. Muttahida Quamiat aur Islam. PP.4-6.

17. Ibid. PP.13-19.

18. Op.cit. Barbara D. Metcalf. PP.99-101.

19. Op.cit. Muttahida Quamiat aur Islam. PP.37-40.

20. Ibid. P.29. and also Dr. Mohd. Hashim Kudwai – Jadeed Hindustan ke siyasi aur samaji Ifkar, P.417, Published by National Council for promotion of Urdu language, Ministry of Human Resource development, Govt. of India, New Delhi.

21. Op.cit. Barbara D. Metcalf. PP.113-115.

22. Ibid. PP 119-120.

23. Ibid. PP.124-125.

24. Ibid. PP. 125-128.

25. Op.cit. Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani, Muttahida Quamiyat aur Islam. PP.45-46.

26. Ibid. PP.47-50.

27. W.S. Blunt, Ideas about India (1985), P.14, published by Kegan Paul Trench & Co. London.

28. Extracted from Indian News London published in Madina, Binjnaur, Vol.19, no. 22,25 March 1930.

29. Op.cit. Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani. P.50., and also William Digby, Prosperous British India, (1969) P.27 published by Sagar Publications, New Delhi.

30. Op.cit. Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani. P.51, Details are also in the articles and lectures of Mr. Beck and Mr. Norrison, Principles of Aligarh College.

31. Op.cit. Barbara D. Metcalf. PP.146-151 and also 'Sir Syed Ke Akhri Mazamin'

32. Op.cit. Qazi Mohd. Zahed-ul-Husaini (Ed.) PP. 182-184.

33. Op.cit. D.R. Goyal, PP.248-250.

34. Ibid. PP.250-252.

35. Ibid. PP.253-254.

CHAPTER - 5

CONCLUSION

Mughal period was followed by British rule in India. When independence movement was launched, Muslims played an important role and offered great sacrifices. They were inspired by the concept of jihad so they took active part in the freedom movement. It was the Muslims who gave the freedom movement potent phrases as Jihad-e-Azadi, Mujahid-e-Azadi, Shahid-e-Azadi and Inquilab-Zindabad and so on.

Muslims have a rich legacy of their contribution in the freedom movement of India, particularly the Ulama of Deoband. The Ulama of Dar-ul-uloom Deoband were pioneer of the freedom movement against the colonial rule. Dar-ul-uloom Deoband is not only an old institution; it is rather a name of the glorious movement, a centre of revolution and political thinking. It nurtured a body of self-sacrificing soldiers of the freedom movement and sympathizers of the community who wept in the grief of the country and made others weep; and tossed about restlessly for the restitution of the India’s dignity. They sacrificed their lives for the attainment of swaraj and also taught lesson of self-sacrifice to others. They shattered the Muslims’ intellectual stagnation, and broke up the spell of the British imperialism, grappling with the contemporary tyrannical powers, dispelled fear and

anxiety from the minds of the country. Not only this; they kindled the candle of freedom in the political wilderness of Aligarh, extricated from the baseness of ideal, created the sense of the superficiality of objective, and in that assembly where the law of muteness was in force, where tongues were chopped off on talking and where sentinels were set on the minds, they blew the trumpet of revolution, for rescuing a large body of young men from the squalor of today's life appointed them on the post of guidance in the struggle for independence of the country. It is a historical fact that the political awakening was created in Aligarh in the beginning of the twentieth century was indebted to Deoband and some other revolutionary movements in the country, and the revolutionary freedom-lovers who then emerged were the products of the spring of thought of Deoband.

The elders of Deoband took part in the struggle for independence of the country; they suffered all the troubles of this path and came out successful in every test. The caravan of resolute men prepared under the leadership of Maulana Mehmood-ul-Hasan including Maulana Ubayadullah Sindhi, Maulana Mian Mansoor Ansari, Maulana Fazl-e-Rabbi (member Hai'at-e Tamizia, Afghanistan), Maulana Sayfur-Rahman Kabuli, Maulana Muhammad Sadiq Karachwi, Mufti Kifayatullah Dehelvi and Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani and many other great personalities. Even today, the graduates of Dar-ul-Uloom Deoband are guiding the country and the community in the field of politics.

Commenting upon the activities of Maulana Mehmood-ul-Hasan and Maulana Ubayadullah Sindhi, the viceroy of India wrote, "Realizing our weakness in India, they have been actually attempting to stir up trouble and even rebellion. Their efforts had not gone waste and they were able to create a strong party in Afghanistan which was in favor of war with the English which compelled the Amir to agree to commence hostilities as soon as a Turco-German force would arrive in the vicinity of Afghanistan".[1]

Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani's father Syed Habibullah decided to send Husain Ahmed Madani to Dar-ul-uloom Deoband with his two brothers to study there. Husain Ahmed Madani studied Dars-e-Nizami (general syllabus) in Dar-ul-uloom Deoband and qualified at the young age of 21 yrs. His father had bayat to Maulana Fazlurahman Sahib. When he passed away they migrated to Madina that was the place from where they originally came. On the instruction of his teacher Maulana Mehmood-ul-Hasan he started teaching. Within a short time he got the grip of the Arabic language. It was during this time that Mehmood-ul-Hasan came for Haj. He stayed in Madina with Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani. It was here that Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani and Shaikh-ul-Hind planned to liberate India. Maulana Mehmood-ul-Hasan used to send letters to Indian soldiers requesting them to revolt against the British. These letters were written on a silk cloth in code language. Hence, this is known as the Silk Letters Conspiracy. Consequently, the conspiracy failed. Both alongwith many

students were arrested and convicted to Long term rigorous imprisonment and sent to Malta.[2]

This is an instance that reveals the role of Ulama (religious teachers) and their whole hearted participation in the national struggle of India to unyoke India from the clutches of British imperialism. It also throws ample light on the patriotic fervor and love of Muslims for India. They had maddening passion to liberate India which cannot be denied at any cost.

In the meantime, in India, due to the maltreatment of Turkey by European powers and the danger of the Muslim holy places falling in hands of Christians, a full-fledged Khilafat movement started, which was backed by the Indian National Congress. The Ulama were called to participate in it because of their contacts with the masses at the grassroots. Apart from this, the Ulama of Deoband to established close contacts between the movement and the masses. They became members and office bearers of the Khilafat committees and extensively toured and delivered speeches to draw the masses to the movement.

Due to the efforts of Maulana Abdul Bari of Firangi Mahal, a meeting of all types of Ulama took place at Delhi on November 25, 1919, which led to the formation of Jamiat-ul-Ulama-i-Hind for carrying out political activities. With the passage of time, it was exclusively monopolized by the Ulama of Deoband. As soon as the Congress decided to launch its Non-Cooperation movement, which included renunciation of titles,

resignation from government service, and non-payment of taxes, the Ulama of Deoband, under the leadership of Maulana Habibur Rahman, once again undertook extensive tours for winning the masses for this movement.[3]

In the meantime, the English brought Maulana Mehmud-ul Hasan and Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani from Malta to Bombay on 7 June, 1920 and released them from confinement. They were warmly greeted by all the prominent leaders of the country, including Mahatma Gandhi. Maulana Mehmud-ul Hasan was honoured with the title of Sahikh-ul-Hind. Although Maulana Mehmud-ul Hasan was not in good health, he did not care for his illness and spent the rest of his life travelled extensively motivating people on behalf of the Khilafat and the Non-Cooperation movement.

Besides, a fatwa was issued justifying Non-Cooperation and Swadeshi on religious grounds. For making alternative arrangements for education for those students who had boycotted the government schools and colleges and those run by the loyalist elements, Jamia Millia Islamia was launched on October 29, 1920. It was inaugurated by Maulana Mehmud-ul Hasan, where he explained the need for liberating the country from the yoke of British imperialists.

After his death, the place of Mehmud-ul-Hasan as leaders of the Ulama of Deoband was taken by his close associate and disciple Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani, known by his title of Shaikh-ul-Islam. To familarise

Swadeshi, he extensively popularized the use of khadi and pointed out that "independence is the fundamental right of every human being."

In July, 1921, Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani, Maulana Kifayatullah and Mufti Azizur Rahman of the Dar-ul-uloom issued a fatwa reiterating the declaration of Jamiat-ul-Ulama-i-Hind at its Bareilly session held on March 24-26, 1921, that "All Government services by which the government is helped are forbidden; specially serving in the police and the army is a great sin because they have to open fire upon their brethren.

It was issued on the eve of heating up of the Greco-Turkish conflict in Asia Minor and the sympathy of the Britishers with the Greeks. In a resolution of Jamiat, they congratulated the Turks on their recent victories and threatened that if the British went to war with Turkey, the Muslims, carrying the congress with them, would launch a Civil Disobedience movement and proclaim India an independent republic. To deter further activities of the Jamiat, Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani was arrested at Deoband. He was whisked away to Karachi, where he was imprisoned in a secluded cell. Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani and others were tried at Karachi and sentenced to two years of rigorous imprisonment. The Ulama of Deoband were involved in demonstration made at the time of the visit of Prince of Wales to India in November, 1921.

The Ulama of Deoband had diverted their attention to the Shuddhi movement of Arya Samaj, through which about 18,000 Malkana

Muslim Rajputs had been converted to Hinduism. Passive attempts to get it suspended failed and, hence, the Ulama of Deoband were compelled to send preachers and propagandists to persuade the converted Rajputs to re-enter the fold of Islam.[4]

In March 1924, Turkey (Kamal Ataturk) abolished Caliphate. The Ulama of Deoband took a realistic stand on the issue and decided to forget the Khilafat question and to pay attention to the home affairs. In 1926, the Jamiat passed a resolution demanding total freedom for India, which was further reiterated at its Peshawar session in 1927. They also participated in the boycott of Simon Commission wholeheartedly.

It is an irony of India's political life that the role of the Ulama (Islamic Scholar) is almost ignored in political discourse both in politics and academics. As a result of it there is lot of confusion about the relationship of religion and politics and about the role of minorities in the freedom movement. It is the duty of the Government to design such books which teaches the young generation the truth of India's freedom for struggle. It will further pave the way for national integration and strengthen the social bonds among various nationalities of the country. If it is ignored consciously or by mistake it is going to inflict serious consequences on the unity and integrity of the country.

Husain Ahmed lived a very simple life. It was his habit to travel in the third class compartment. This itself is proof because if one has to

see the conditions of the third class compartments then they would understand the reality of this situation. He was very kind and hospitable. There would be always ten to fifteen guests present for meals. Being a great politician many people had ascended the heights of spirituality under his guidance.[5]

Husain Ahmad had entered the field of politics at the instance of his revered teacher and leader Mehmud-ul-Hasan. But his politics were not emotional. His approach was intellectual to the problems of society and state. This is proved by his writings on India's politics and economics and on international affairs. It is astonishing to know that a Maulavi had vast information on the politics, economics and history of India and on the international relations of the western powers with Islamic countries. There is no doubt that his residence in Mecca-the hub of the Muslim world, for over a decade and a half and his incarceration in Malta for nearly five years had brought him into contact with many imminent men from Mulsim countries. As also with Europeans-Germans, Austrians, Italians and others, from whom he learnt a great deal of international affairs. He has left behind a considerable quantity of writings which contain his approach and philosophy on the subject.

Like other serious Hindu and Muslim thinkers of the times Husain Ahmad was concerned with the fundamental problems of life both in

its infinite inwardness and in its total outer expression in the fellowship of man and nature.

Being Muslim scholar he was convinced that the Quran-the word of God, and Hadith-the record of the Prophet's saying and deeds, offered complete guidance in the realms of human life. It followed that religion was an all-pervasive, an all-comprehensive rule of life, and therefore not only matters of belief, worship and morals ought to be under its direction, but also matters relating to social economic, political and cultural spheres. There can be no discord between eternal and temporal affairs. [6]

In the first volume of his autobiography major part is devoted to an examination of the destructive consequences of British imperialism in India and the second is covered by an account of the breaches of solemn agreements and of treacheries of western powers in their dealings with the Muslim countries, especially the Ottoman Empire. It is pointed out that among these powers the record of the British is uncivilised.

In the natural facts the conclusion is inevitable, the British are the most inveterate enemies of Islam and the Muslims and that, they should destroyed the British Empire which is a menace to all the people of Asia and Afirca.

Husain Ahmad recognized that the Congress was instrumental for seizing power, and in spite of provocations and differences he never wavered in his decision of 1920 to support the organization, especially after

the Congress declaration of 1929 that India's goal was complete independence. His unequivocal stand on the political problem of India and his outright support to the Congress drew him into many controversies.

Husain Ahmad Madani was the advocate of Hindu-Muslim unity. He held that the people of India irrespective of religious differences ought to form a united nation in order to secure independence and pursue policies of common welfare. In a speech he stated that the modern nations were constituted on the principle of territoriality and not race or religion. Iqbal regarded the statement as an attack upon his theory that the only basis of nationality (Qaum) was religion, and that nationality founded upon race, language, territory, was accursed. In his view territorial nationality was an unislamic concept. He published an article which argued that neither Arabic philology nor Islamic literature supported Madani's contention. He made uncomplimentary remarks on his learning and ridiculed him in verse.

Arguments and counter-arguments flowed from the two literary giants. Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani felt the pressing need to write a rejoinder to Iqbal's article because Iqbal's views were likely to cause a great deal of harm to the national struggle and Hindu-Muslim unity. Thus, Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani wrote a monograph entitled Muttahida Qaumiyat aur Islam (Composite Nationalism and Islam). This scholarly work mainly deals with two aspects: first the meaning of the word *qaum* and how it

is distinct from the word *millat* and secondly the views of the *Quran, Hadith* and Islamic history on the problem.

This book is the monograph of a freedom-loving, towering religious and political personality who exhorted Indians to unite, transcending their cultural and religious differences, and fight for freedom from foreign rule under the banner of composite nationalism. His arguments at the time of British occupation were (and they remain valid in the present-day political scenario as well) that despite being culturally, linguistically and religiously different, people residing in the territorial boundaries of India are but one nation. Any or all efforts to divide them on the basis of Caste, colour, creed, culture and religion are a ploy by the ruling power to perpetuate its hegemony and implement its nefarious designs. According to him the term *Millat* has a different connotation. It applies only to the community of faith (*Iman*) and canonical law (*Sharia*). It applies to every religious community whatever the common religion.[7]

He defined common nationality as "By united nationality I mean the same type of united nationality which was founded by the Prophet, for whom be praise and on whom be peace, among the people of Medina. That is, I desire that the inhabitants of India-whatever their religion, ought in their capacity, as Indians and residents of one country, to become one nation… No one should obstruct the other in any religious matter. On the other hand, all the peoples inhabiting India ought to be free in the profession

of their religious beliefs, ideals and worship. They should be free in following their religious customs, ritual and precepts, and in so far as their religion permitted the propagation in a peaceful manner.”[8]

The patriotism of Indian Muslims is being questioned today. Those who question Muslims’ love for this country call themselves ‘Hindu’ and shout slogans such as *Garv se Khao Hum Hindu hain*, without understanding that the term ‘Hindu’ is not the appellation of followers of any religion. It is a geographical definition of people residing in a territorial region, i.e. India. By virtue of this definition, all people residing within the geographical territory of India, whether they are descendants of Aryans or Dravidians or Mongols or Arabs or Anglo Saxons, are Hindus.

Maulana’s have been ignored not only in post independence studies, they got side lined in the last stages of negotiations with the British on the question of transfer of powers, Jinnah was treated with reverence by Gandhi, though it was well known that time, that he was playing the British game. It was because of the following that Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani could claim the urban and rural poor; whereas the politics after the acceptance of 1935 Government of India act was confined to urban middle and rural feudal classes.

The partition was the result of competition for power between the ‘secular’ elite of the two communities, rather than justified by the theology of Islam or Hinduism. Any attempt to project the Muslim clergy as

separatists would be futile as Muslim religious leaders vehemently opposed the two-nation theory and advocated composite nationalism on religious grounds.

He rejected the League's two-nation theory and predicted the harmful effects which were likely to ensue from it both in internal and external affairs if India was divided. He wrote that the formation of two separate states would do the greatest harm to the Muslims, "their unity will vanish, in the provinces where they are in a minority, their political and economic status will be destroyed and in their majority provinces their central government will become involved in insoluble internal and external difficulties,… the government unable to sustain its position will be obliged to seek the assistance of some other power, with the result that the equilibrium of economy will be transferred into the hands of foreign governments and capitalists government, because of paucity of resources and aggravation of expenditure, will not be able to discharge properly its defence responsibilities, and will have to tie its defence with the defence arrangements of the governments of the United Kingdom, and entrust the reins of its political future in their hands.[9]

By discussing the activities and trends of various other Muslim political parties and movements, reveal that the Muslim League neither represented the interest of the entire Muslim community in India nor was it popular amongst a vast population of Indian Muslims.

So far as Abul Ala Maududi was concerned, Husain Ahmed completely repudiated his religious views, which he considered were opposed to the orthodox Sunni doctrine and were in the same class as the heretical opinions of the Kharajis and others. Maududi's contention that the Muslims could only live in an exclusive society and could not share political authority with non-Muslims was utterly wrong and quite unacceptable.

On the constitution of a free and undivided India he held quite definite different views. They may be summarized under the following heads:

(1) The Indian State shall be a republic, and its President shall be chosen by election. He will exercise the supreme executive authority.

(2) In the Central government, the Muslims will be in a minority, but their religious, political and economic rights will be protected. The centre will deal with a limited number of subjects, viz., defence, foreign affairs, communications, transport and finance. The remaining subjects will be provincial. The religious affairs will be dealt with by the provincial governments.

(3) Education will be a provincial subject.

(4) Muslim canonical law (*Shariat*) or Muslim criminal law will not be enforced.

(5) The organization of government will be on the basis of partnership of various communities.[10]

Soon after liberation of India, Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani left the political field but he carried with him his religious teachings. Normally a person feels after achievement of liberation struggle about position; and status for the role he played. However, Husain Ahmed Madani was not interested in all these things. The only and only theme was liberation of the country and it was liberated, his object was achieved. If he wishes, he could have received the highest position that any person could have received but he left all of that and joined Darul Uloom Deoband and dedicated himself to teaching. When he was called for awards and honours for those took part in the liberation struggle Husain Ahmed Madani declined to accept the award and explained his refusal by simply mentioning that this was against the way of our pious predecessors. This is a prime example of sincerity *(Ikhlas)*. He took part in the struggle solely for the pleasure of Almighty and not because of attaining a position in society.

In 1957 when he was on journey to Madras he suffered a heart attack. On his returning back to Deoband the doctors diagnosed it to be dilation of heart. Treatment by local and outside doctors continued for some time but there was no improvement. Then the Unani treatment was started whereby some relief was felt. On 3rd and 4th December his disposition was quite calm, and on 5th December he became quite cheerful; he took his lunch

after several days and lay down for a siesta. At 3 p.m. when it was wished to waken him up for the Zuhar prayer it was found that Maulana Madani had gone to glory in sleep. The bier was brought to the Darul Hadith at 9-00 p.m. Hadhrat Maulana Muhammad Zakariya, Shaikhul Hadith of Mazahirul Uloom Saharanpur, led the funeral service and between the night of 5th and 6th December 1957, this treasure of knowledge and gnosis that great savant who had kept the candle of prophetic Hadith lighted in Darul Uloom for 32 years and gleaning from whose harvest of learning and accomplishments the students of prophetic knowledge had always felt pride-was laid to rest in dust.

When the President of India Dr. Rajendra Prasad heard the news of his sad demise, he said, "I am very sad, when I heard about the sad demise of Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani, the President of Dar-ul-Uloom and Jamiat Ulama-e-Hind. He was great personality, Islamic scholar and a crusader of freedom movement of India. It's a extra ordinary loss for the nation."[11]

The Prime Minister of India Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said, "The news of the death of Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani severely injured my feelings, the death of Husain Ahmed Madani is a death of a patriot. He played the leading role in the national movement. On this incident I express condolence to his family and Dar-ul-uloom Deoband." [12]

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Education Minister of India said, “The services rendered by Husain Ahmed Madani towards nation have a great value, we can’t forget him, who devoted himself for the cause of nation. He infused a new spirit in Congress. He faced the hardship in the prison and outside. His death is the great national loss.”[13]

Tarachand, a well-known historian wrote,

> “He held that people of India irrespective of religious differences ought to form a united nation in order to secure Independence and pursue the policies of common welfare.”[14]

Dr. Rafiq Zakaria, author and politician wrote,

“One of the tallest among the religious leaders of the early forties was Maulana Husain Ahmed Madni. He had advised Muslims against partition, reminding them that the Prophet himself had preached and practiced the virtues of united, composite nationhood, when he ruled Madina. The harm that division had done to both Hindus and Muslims should be an eye opener for all those who believed that hate can be the substitute for love and distrust and enmity can be more potent than trust and friendship.[15]

Barbara Daly Metcalf described Husain Ahmed Madni in the book (Husain Ahmed Madni, The Jihad for Islam and India’s Freedom. Oxford Oneworld 2009) that, he was a political activist, Islamic Scholar and

supporter of Gandhi during the struggle for India's independence. Immersed in Islamic scholarship from an early age, he sought to apply Muslim teaching to the urgent issues of his day. Humane and fiercely dedicated whether campaigning against the separation of Pakistan, or in favour of democracy and inter-religious peace, he fought relentlessly for what he believed in.

In many languages like Arabic, Gujrati, Persian and Urdu elegy (poem and song something about dead one) had been written upon him.

The sacrifices, which Maulana Husain Madani made in the cause of freedom- forms a glorious chapter in the History of freedom movement. His intense devotion to the cause is manifest in his daily life. There was no sacrifice which he did was not prepared to offer – financial or otherwise. He chose to spend the entire span of his life from boyhood to death and eking out existence on a miserable pittance, stinted over creature comforts and on many occasions was obliged to put up with semi-starvation. He spent years in exile, or in British prisons- abused, maltreated, denied ordinary conveniences of life and put on the poorest prison rations. He suffered uncomplainingly the hardships and deprivations which were heaped upon him and which he welcomed as an offering in the service of the country, man and God.

A commemorative postal stamp for Shaikhul Islam Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani, was released by the Union HRD, communications and information technology minister Kapil Sibal at India Habitat Centre on

29 August 2012 before a distinguished gathering which included Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani's grandson and Jamiatul Ulama leader Maulana Mahmood Madani, K. Rahman Khan, former deputy chairman of Rajya Sabha, film director Mahesh Bhat, Pandit N. K. Sharma, founder of Universal Association of Spiritual Awareness and many political and religious leaders.

Kapil Sibal, while paying rich tributes to Maulana Madani for his important role and sacrifices in the national and freedom movement, admitted that forgetting this great freedom fighter and not issuing even a postal stamp in his memory earlier was a lapse on the part of the government but now, with the release of this stamp in his memory, this lapse has been removed. He hinted, while speaking on this occasion that a study on the life and services of Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani will be made part of Indian schools syllabus so that young generations could learn about the important services rendered and great sacrifices made by him and other religious leaders of the Muslim community for India's freedom.

Husain Ahmed Madni was an Islamic scholar of international repute and a stalwart of India's freedom struggle. His contribution to India's emergence as a secular democratic nation-sate ranks with that of Mahatma Gandhi, Maulana Azad and Jawaharlal Nehru. As an anti-imperialist crusader

he spent long years in British jails between 1914 and 1947. His most outstanding contribution in his theoretical tract '*Islam aur Muttahida Quamiyat*' (United Nationalism and Islam). He carried on an uncompromising campaign against Two Nation Theory and opposed Muslim league's attempt at partitioning India. Predominantly due to this a large number of Muslims from Eastern U.P. and Bihar declined to migrate to Pakistan. He was against the creation of Pakistan. He was of the view that in the present times, nations are formed on the basis of homeland and not on ethnicity and religion.

The entire perspective on the communal question will be changed and will help in understanding the great sacrifices and role played by muslim community in liberating India, once we recognize the role of Ulama.

References:

1. Islamic Voice, November 2003, Vol.16-11 No.203.
2. Maulana Husain Ahmed's Autobiography "Naqsh-e-Hayat" Vol.II 1999, PP169-172 published by Maktaba Diniyah Deoband.
3. P.N. Chopra, Role of Indian Muslims in the struggle for freedom (1979), PP.97-100 published by Light and life publishers, New Delhi.
4. D.R. Goyal, Autobiography of Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani, 2004, P.100, published by Anamika Publisher and Distributor, New Delhi.
5. Maulana Syed Abul Hasan Ali Husna Nadvi, Purane Chirag, Vol. I, P.90, Maktaba Firdous, Luknow.
6. Tarachand, History of Freedom Movement in India, Vol. II, 1972, P-260, published by Publications Division, Ministry of Information and broadcasting, Govt. of India.
7. Barbara D. Metcalf, Composite Nationalism and Islam, 2005, PP.60-65, Manohar Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi.
8. Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani, "Mutahida Qaumiyat aur Islam", 2002, PP.37-38, published by Al-Jamiat Book Depot, Delhi.
9. Op.cit, Tarachand P-263.
10. Ibid. P-262.
11. Quazi Mohd. Zahed-ul-Husaini, Chirag-e-Muhammed, (A Biography of Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani), 1998, P-283.
12. Ibid. P-286.

13. Ibid.

14. Tara Chand (1972), History of Freedom Movement in India, P.256, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi.

15. Dr. Rafiq Zakaria, The Man Who Divided India, (2001) P.XII (preface) Published by Ramdas Bhadkal for Popular Prakashan.

BIBLOGRAPHY

1. Husain Ahmed Madani, Naqsh-e-Hayat (1999), Vol.I., Maktaba Diniyat, Deoband.

2. Husain Ahmed Madani, Naqsh-e-Hayat (1999), Vol.II., Maktaba Diniyat, Deoband.

3. Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani, *Muttahida Qaumiyat Aur Islam* (2002), Published by Al-Jamiat Book Depot, New Delhi.

4. Letter 143 in Maktubat-e-Shaikh-ul-Islam, Maulana Najmuddin Islahi (Ed.), Vol. IV, (2012) Published by Al-Jamiat B. Depot, New Delhi.

5. Husain Ahmed Madani, Hamara Hindustain Aur Uske Fazail, Jamiat Book Depot, Delhi.

6. Asjad Madani, Jamait Ulema-e-Hind ka Jung-e-Azadi mai Hissa, Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind, New Delhi.

7. Asjad Madani, Role of Jamait Ulema-e-Hind in Freedom Struggle, Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind, New Delhi.

8. Interview with Asjad Madani (Son of Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani).

9. A.C. Banerjee, Two Nations, (1981), Concept Publishing company, New Delhi.

10. Abdul Quddus Hashmi Nadvi, Pakistan aur Hindus (1941), Published by Dar-ul-Ishat Siyasi, Usmani Road, Hyderabad (Deccan).

11. Abul Hasan Bara Bankvi, *Malfuzaat Hazrat Madani*, (2003), Published by Darul Ishaat, Deoband, (U.P.)
12. Anil Saxena (ed) Encylopedia of history of India (2006) Vol.30, Anmol Publication Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
13. Anwar Moazzam, Indian National Consciousness Growth and Development, (1972), Kalamkar Publication, New Delhi.
14. Arun Bhattacharjee, the Prophets of Modern Indian Nationalism, (1993), Ashish Publishing house, Delhi.
15. Asgar Ali Engineer and Moin Shakir (Ed.), Communication in India (1985) Ajanta Publication, Jawahar Nagar, Delhi.
16. Asgar Ali Engineer, Islam and Muslims, A Critical Reassessment, (1985), PP.6—62, Published by Kiran Gupta, Printwell Publishers, Mangal Marg, Jaipur.
17. Ateeq Siddiqui, *Sir Sayyed Ahmed Khan Ek Siyasi Mutala* (2011) Published by National Council for the New Delhi (Maktaba Jama New Delhi)
18. B.K. Ahluwalia & Shashi Ahluwalia, Muslims and India's Freedom Movement (1985), Published by Heritage Publishers, 4C, Ansari Road, Darya Ganj, New Delhi.
19. Birendra Prasad, Indian Nationalism and Asia (1979), B.R. Publishing Corporation.
20. Chirag-e-Mohammed, biography of Maulana Husain Ahmed Madni, edited by Qazi Mohd. Zahed-ul-Husaini, Third edition (2003) published by Al-Jamiat Book Depot, New Delhi.
21. Composite Nationalism and Islam (Maulana Husain Ahmed Madani,(2005) Introduced by Barbara D. Metcalf, Published by Manohar Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi.

22. D.R. Goyal, Husain Ahmad Madani, A Biographical Study, published by Anamika Publishers and Distributors, Daryaganj, New Delhi 110002.
23. Dietmar Rothermand, the Phases of Indian Nationalism (1970), Published by Nackiketa Publications Limited, 22, Naushir Bharucha Road, Bombay-7.
24. Dr. Afzar Iqbal, Contemporary Muslim World, (2007), Adam Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi.
25. Dr. Fauque Kareemi (Ed.), *Asbaab-e-Baghawat-e-Hind*, (1985), Khutub Khana, Anjuman-e-Taraque-e-Talim Urdu, Jama Masjid, Delhi.
26. Dr. Ishwari Prasad and S.K. Subedar, Hindu-Muslim Problems (1974), Chugh Publications, Allahabad.
27. Dr. Mohammed Umar, Badruddin Tyabji, (1997), Ultra Publications, Bangalore.
28. Dr. Mohd. Hashim Kudwai – Jadeed Hindustan ke siyasi aur samaji Ifkar, Published by National Council for promotion of Urdu language, Ministry of Human Resource development, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
29. Dr. Padmasha, Indian National Congress and the Muslims, (1980), Published by M.L. Gupta, Rajesh Publications, New Delhi.
30. Dr. Rafiq Zakaria, The Man Who Divided India, (2001), Published by Ramdas Bhadkal for Popular Prakashan.
31. Dr. S.M. Ikram, Indian Muslims and Partion of India, (1995), Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi.
32. Dr. Sayyad Abdul Bari, Azad Hindustan mein Muslim Tanzeeme Ek jaiza., Institute of objective studies, New Delhi.
33. Dr. Sayyed Abid Husain, Hindustani Qaumiat Aur Quami Tahzeeb, (1946), Maktaba Jama Delhi.

34. Dr. Syed Abed Husain, *Hindustani Musalmaan Aaina-e-Aiyyammein* (1991), Published by Dr. Syed Abid Husain Memorial Trust, New Delhi-25.
35. Dr. Zia-ul-Hasan Farooqui, The Deoband School and Demand for Pakistan, (1963), Asia Publications, Delhi.
36. Durga Das, India from curzon to Nehru and after S.T. James Palace, London, (1969).
37. E.W. Thomson, History of India; Shrishti Book Distributors, Daryaganj, New Delhi.
38. Ela Sen, Indian Political leaders and the National Movement, (1986), Anmol Publications, Delhi.
39. Encyclopedia of Muslim Biography Vol.III Edited by Rajendra Kumar Singh, published by A.P.H. Publishing Corporation, 5, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi – 110002.
40. Er. R.R.P. Singh, Hindu-Muslim Relations in contemporary India (1990), Wisdom Publication, New Delhi.
41. Freedom Movement and Urdu Prose (2004), Dr. Zia-Ur-Rehman Siddiqui, Translated by Arinder Seth, Vikas Prakash, Kanpur.
42. G. Allana, Eminent Muslim Freedom Fighters, (1969), Niraj Publishing House, Delhi.
43. G.Aloysius, Nationalism without a Nation in India (1997), published by Manzar Khan, Oxford University Press, Jai Singh Road, New Delhi.
44. G.M. Banatwalla, Religion and Politics in India, (1992), Published by G.M. Banatwalla, Bombay 400 008.
45. Ganeshwar Nayak, A study of modern Indian History (2003), Published by Anmol Publication Pvt. Ltd.
46. Humayun Kabir, Muslim Politics, (1969), Firma K.L. Mukhpadhyay, Calcutta-9.

47. Husain, B.Tyabji, Tayabji (A Biography of the Nationalist Muslim Leader, Published by Thacker and Co., Bombay, (1952)).

48. IAN Bryant Wells, Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity. Jinha's Early Politics, (2006), Published by Permanent black, Delhi 110092.

49. Indian History (Modern) (2003) Revised and updated by Nonica Datta, Published by Aalok Wadhwa, Managing Director, Encyclopedia Britanica India Pvt., Ltd.

50. Iqqtidar Husain Siddiqui, Islam and Muslims in South Asia, (1987), Adam Publishers and Distributors, Matia Mahel, Delhi-6.

51. Jagannath Patnaik, British Rule in India (1976), Published by S.Chand and Company, Ram Nagar, New Delhi.

52. Jagdish Saran Sharma, India, Since the Advent of British, Published by S.Chand and Co., Ramnagar, New Delhi – 55.

53. Jim Masselos (1985), Indian Nationalism – An History, Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi-110016.

54. John Dewey, Freedom and culture, (1939), Popular Prakashan, Bombay.

55. K.K.Gangadharan (Ed.) Indian National Conciousness – Growth and Development (1972), Published by D.R. Goyal for Kalamkar Prakashan, New Delhi.

56. K.M. Munshi, Pilgrimage to Freedom, (1967), Bhartiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay-7.

57. Kailash Chandra, Jinha and the Communal Problem in India, (1986), Anmol Publication Ext. Delhi.

58. Kailash Chandra, Jinnah and the Communal Problem in India (1986), Anmol Publication India, New Delhi.

59. Krishan Mohan, Indian National Congress and the freedom Movement (1999), Published by Book ENCLAVE, Jaipur.

60. Lal Bahadur, J.C. Johri (Edi.), Indian Freedom Movement and thought, Sterling Publishers, New Delhi.

61. Lawrence Ziring, Pakistan at the cross current of History (2005), Manas Publication, New Delhi.

62. M.M. Rehman, The Congress Crisis, (1938), Associated Publishing House, New Delhi.

63. M.R. Masani, Congress Misrule and the Swatantra Alternative, (1966), Manaktala and Sons Pvt. Ltd., Bombay.

64. M.R.A. Baig, The Muslim Dilemma in India, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi.

65. Maulana Mohd. Abbas Shaad (Ed), Bartanvi Samraj ne hamein kaise loota written by Maulana Husain Ahmed Madni, published by Farid Book Depot, New Delhi.

66. Maulana Mohd. Miya Sahab, *Aseeran-e-Malta,* 2002, Published by Kutubkhana Naimya, Deoband.

67. Maulana Mohd. Miya Saheb, Ulema-e-Haq, Vol.II (2008), Faisal Publications, Jama Masjid, Deoband.

68. Maulana Sayyed Mohammed Miya, Tahrik Shaikh-ul-Hind, Record of Silk Letters Conspiracy Case (In the language of British Govt., l-Jamiat Book Depot, Qasim Jaan Street, Delhi-6.

69. Maulana Sayyed Mohd. Miya Sahab, Ulama-e-Haq aur unke Mujahedana Karname (2008) Vol. II, Faisal Publishing, Jama Masjid, Deoband.

70. Maulana Wahiduddin Khan, Indian Muslim (1994), Published by Al Risala Books, New Delhi.

71. Mewaram Gupt Saturiya, *Hidustan ki Jange Aazadi Ke Musalman Mujahedeen* 1815-1947 (December 1988).

72. Mohd. Salman Mansoorpuri, *Tehrike Aazadi-e-Hind mein Muslim Ulema Aur Awam Ka Kirdar* (2000), pub. By Zam Zam Book Depot, Deoband, Saharanpur, U.P.

73. Moin Shakir (Ed.), Religion, State and Politics (1989), Ajanta Publications, Delhi.

74. Moin Shakir, Muslim and Indian Congress, (1987), Ajanta Publication Delhi.

75. Moin Shakir, Muslims and Indian Nationalism, Edited by K.K. Gangadharan, Indian National Conciousness, Growth and Development, (1972), Kalamkar Publication, New Delhi.

76. Mushirul Hasan, Builders of Modern India, M.A. Ansari (1995) published by the Ministry of India, Patiala house, New Delhi.

77. N. Jayapalon, History of the Freedom Movement 1857 to 1947, Published by Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi-27.

78. Nagendra Kumar Singh, Islamic Mysticism in India (1996), published by A.P.H. Publishing Corporation, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi.

79. P.N.Chopra, Role of Indian Muslims in the Struggle for freedom (1979), published by Light and Life publishers, Paharganj, New Delhi.

Padmashala, Indian National Congress and the Muslims, (1980), Published by Rajesh Publications, Ansari Road, Daryagunj, New Delhi.

80. Prof. Zafer Ahmed Nizami (*Hindustan ke chand siyasi rehnuma*), Anjum-e-urdu, New Delhi. (2000)

81. Qazi Moh Zahed-ul-Husaini, Chirag-e-Mohammed (2003), Published by Al-Jamiat Book Depot, Delhi-6.

82. R.C.Majumdar, studies in the cultural history of India (1960), Published by Shivalal Agarwal & Co. Pvt. Ltd., Agra-3.

83. R.Suntharalingam, Indian Nationalism, An Historical Analysis (1983), Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., Ansari Road, New Delhi.

84. Ram Gopal, How India Struggle for Freedom, (1967), K.R.Samant, The Book Centre Pvt. Ltd., Bombay.

85. Report of the Third Indian National Congress (Authorised Urdu Version, Published by Ganga Prasad Verma, Lucknow, 1888).

86. S. Abid Husain, The Destiny of Indian Muslims (1969), Published by P.S. Jaya Singhe Asia Published House, Bombay.

87. S. Nihal Singh, My India, (1982), Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi.

88. S.R. Ghosh, Muslims in Indian Democracy (1984), Ashish Publishing House Punjabi Bagh, New Delhi.

89. Santimoy Ray, Freedom Movement and Indian Muslims, Published by People's Publishing house, New Delhi.

90. Satyendra Kishore, National Integration in India, (1987), Oriental University, London.

91. Sayed Ibrahim, Fikri, Hindustani Musalmano Ka Jang-e-Azadi Mein Hissa (1997), Published by Maktaba Jamia Ltd. New Delhi – 110025.

92. Subhash C. Kashyap, History of the freedom movement 1857-1947, National Publishing House, New Delhi.

93. Sumit Sarkar, The Swadeshi Movement in Bengal, (1973), People's Publishing House, New Delhi.

94. Syed Tufail Ahmed Manglury, Musalmano ka Roshan Mustaqbil, Nizami Press Badayu, (1938).

95. Tara Chand (1972), History of Freedom Movement in India, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi.

96. Tara Chand, History of India, Vol.2, The Director Publications Ministry of Information and Broad Casting, Government Of India, Patiala House, New Delhi.

97. V.D. Mahajan, Modern Indian History (1988), S.Chand and Company Pvt. Ltd.

98. W.S. Blunt, Ideas about India (1985), published by Kegan Paul Trench & Co. London.

99. William Digby, Prosperous British India, (1969), published by Sagar Publications, New Delhi.

100. Y.B. Mathur, Growth of Muslim Politics in India, (1979), Pragati Publication, New Delhi-110053.

101. Z.M. Khan (Ed) 100 great Muslim Leaders of the 20th Century, published by Institute of objective studies, New Delhi. India.

102. Zafar Ahmed Nizami, Builders of Modern India (Hakim Ajmal Khan) (1988), published by The Director Publications Division Ministry of - Information and Broadcasting government of India, New Delhi 110001.

JOURNALS, PERIODICALS & NEWS PAPERS.

1. The Indian Journal of Political Science, Meerut.
2. Al Jamiat, Weekly, Delhi.
3. The Economic & Political Science Weekly.
4. Ifkar Montly, Delhi.
5. Patron Monthly.
6. Al Risalah, Monthly, Delhi.

7. Jung-e-Azadi Aur Musalmaan by Gufran Ahmed, Delhi.

8. Munsif Urdu Daily, Hyderabad.

9. Siyasat, Urdu Daily, Hyderabad.

10. Asia Express Urdu Daily, Aurangabad.

11. Aurangabad Times Urdu Daily, Aurangabad.

12. Lokmat Times, (English) Daily, Aurangabad.

WEBSITES:

1. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Darul_Uloom_Deoband

2. http://islamicvoice.com/november.2003/history.htm#ss

3. http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Shaykhul_Islam_Maulana_Hussain_Ahmad_Madani&action=edit

4. http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%27The_Silk_Handkerchief_Conspiracy%27&action=edit

5. http://www.almahmood.org/

6. http://www.almahmood.org/muftimahmood.html

7. http://attalib.blogspot.com/2007/04/maulana-husain-ahmad-madni-ra-in.html

8. http://zakariyya.wordpress.com/

9. http://www.darululoom-deoband.com/english/aboutdarululoom/main.htm

10. http://www.indianmuslims.info/news/articles